BX 5137 .G5 v.1
Gibson, Edgar C. S. 1848-
1924.
The Thirty-nine Articles of
the Church of England

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

EXPLAINED WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, D.D.

VICAR OF LEEDS AND PREBENDARY OF WELLS
SOMETIME PRINCIPAL OF WELLS THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

ARTICLES I–VIII

LONDON
METHUEN & CO.
NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & CO.
1896

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1
The Forty-Two Articles of 1553 12
The Elizabethan Articles 30
The Royal Declaration 47
Puritan Attempts to amend or supplement the Articles . . 51
History of Subscription to the Articles 57
The Chief Divisions of the Articles 69

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF 1553 70

ARTICLE I.—OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY 90
The Grounds on which the Doctrine is accepted . . . 92
The History of the Doctrine in the Church, and the Growth of Technical Phraseology in connection with it . . . 103
The Explanation of the Doctrine 112

ARTICLE II.—OF THE WORD OR SON OF GOD WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN 119
The Divinity and Eternal Generation of the Son . . . 121
The Incarnation 135
The Atonement 144

ARTICLE III.—OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL . . 159
The Meaning of the word Hell 163
The Scriptural Grounds for the Doctrine, and the Object of the Descent 166
The History of the Doctrine in the Church, and of the Clause in the Creed referring to it 175

ARTICLE IV.—OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST 181
The Resurrection of Christ 183
The Ascension and Session at the Right Hand of the Father . 189
The Return to Judgment 196

PAGE

ARTICLE V.—OF THE HOLY GHOST 198
The Divinity of the Holy Ghost 199
The Distinct Personality 201
The Doctrine of the Procession 209

ARTICLE VI.—OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION 230
The Position of Holy Scripture as the Sole Source of Necessary Doctrine 233
The Canon of Holy Scripture 248
The Position of "The Other Books" 274

ARTICLE VII.—OF THE OLD TESTAMENT 280
The Old Testament is not contrary to the New . . . 283
The Old Fathers did not look only for Transitory Promises . 287
The Ceremonial and Civil Law of the Jews is not binding on Christians 294
The Moral Law remains of Lasting and Universal Obligation . 294

ARTICLE VIII.—OF THE THREE CREEDS 296
Creeds in General 297
The Apostles' Creed 305
The Nicene Creed 316
The Athanasian Creed 329

INDEX 357

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

INTRODUCTION

1. Introductory

It has been pointed out[1] that in the course of the Church's history there are two special eras of what is sometimes called "Symbolism," *i.e.* Creed-Making, or the composition of formularies of faith,—the fourth and fifth centuries, and the sixteenth. The reason for this is obvious. Each age was emphatically an age of religious controversy. After the victory of Constantine over Maxentius and the publication of the Edict of Milan by the joint Emperors Constantine and Licinius (A.D. 313), religious questions and discussions attained a publicity which had hitherto been impossible. There followed, of necessity, a period of definition of the Church's faith. The great Arian controversy had already begun when Constantine found himself sole ruler of the Roman Empire; and now questions were asked as to the meaning of the Church's creed which, when once formally raised, required a clear answer. Thus the terminology of philosophy was pressed into the service of the Christian faith, in order to interpret to thoughtful minds in their own language the belief

[1] *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. vii. p. 134.

which had been implicitly held by Christians from the beginning. In this way, in the "Nicene" Creed and the doctrinal decisions of the first four General Councils, the fundamental Articles of the faith were once for all defined, and since then the Church has never varied in her expression of them.

The formularies of faith belonging to the sixteenth century are of a very different character. Instead of the crisp, short summaries of the main articles of Christian belief, drawn up in the form of creeds, we are confronted with verbose and lengthy "Confessions," in the form of Articles, bristling with controversial points, and often negative rather than positive, denouncing and protesting against some supposed error, but failing to set forth in any systematic form the definite positive truth to be held on the subject. The religious upheaval of the time had let loose a spirit of universal questioning. "Authority" was widely discarded; and while the fundamental articles of the faith were once more passed in review men did not rest content with the consideration of these, but examined afresh the whole circle of Christian doctrine, and threw doubts on matters only remotely bearing upon the faith once for all committed to the saints. Moreover, fresh complications arose from the confusion in which the question of the duties and rights of the civil power was entangled. In an age when the foundations of the system on which society had rested for centuries were seriously shaken, such subjects as the right of the magistrate to interfere with the belief of the individual, and the limits of his authority over conscience, naturally assumed a prominence hitherto unknown. Thus it became necessary for all bodies of Christians to state their position on topics which might otherwise have remained undefined; and there sprang into existence that bewildering mass of elaborate confessions of faith, ex-

tending to subjects which belong to the borderland between religion and politics, which forms one of the special characteristics of this century. If the fourth century was the age of CREEDS, the sixteenth is the age of ARTICLES.

It will be seen, then, that the Thirty-Nine Articles do not stand alone; nor can they be rightly interpreted without reference to various other documents belonging to the same age, or without some knowledge of their history. Not only are they the last of a series of formularies of faith, issued with more or less authority by the English Church during the course of the Reformation, but also, in order to be rightly understood, they require comparison with other, not altogether dissimilar, forms put forth elsewhere.

The earlier formularies put forth in the Church of England are the following :—

1. **The Ten Articles of 1536.** This document is noteworthy as being the first confession issued by the English Church in this period of transition. As might be expected from a consideration of the date at which it appeared, it " bore the character of a compromise between the old and new learning."[1] It was the work of the Convocation, Cromwell having conveyed to that body the King's wish that controversies should be put an end to " through the determination of you and of his whole parliament." The Articles were ten in number, and were divided into two parts, the first five on doctrine: I. The principal Articles concerning our Faith. II. The Sacrament of Baptism. III. The Sacrament of Penance. IV. The Sacrament of the Altar. V. Justification. In the second part there followed five " concerning the laudable ceremonies used in the Church." VI. Of Images. VII. Of Honouring of Saints. VIII. Of Pray-

[1] Dixon's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. p. 415.

ing to Saints. IX. Of Rites and Ceremonies. X. Of Purgatory.[1]

As evidence of their *transitional* character the following facts may be noted :—

(*a*) Penance is spoken of as a sacrament necessary for man's salvation, but is the only rite to which the name of a sacrament is applied, besides Baptism and the Eucharist.

(*b*) While the doctrine of the Real Presence is strongly asserted no mention is made of Transubstantiation.

(*c*) Images are to be retained as representers of virtue and good example, but superstitious worshipping of them is to be abolished. Saints are to be honoured, and held in reverence, and their prayers are to be asked for by us, " so that it be done without any vain superstition, so as to think that any saint is more merciful or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any saint doth serve for one thing more than other, or is patron of the same."

(*d*) Many medieval ceremonies are retained as useful, though having no power to remit sins.

(*e*) Prayers for the departed are to be continued, but abuses connected with the doctrine of purgatory are abolished.

The Articles, when signed by Convocation and approved by the King, were published with the following title :—

" Articles devised by the Kinges highness majestie, to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoid contentious opinions, which articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realm.—Anno MDXXXVI."

Thus, although the initiative was claimed for the " supreme head," care was taken to assert the approval of the clergy, as represented in Convocation.

[1] The Articles are given in full in Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, Appendix i., and in Bishop Lloyd's *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 1.

2. In the following year, 1537, this formulary was superseded by **The Institution of a Christian Man,** or, as it is commonly called, "The Bishops' Book." This document contained "the exposition or interpretation of the Common Creed, of the Seven Sacraments, of the Ten Commandments, and of the Pater Noster, and the Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory." The articles on Justification and Purgatory are copied verbatim from those in the Ten Articles, and in general the character of the teaching contained in the two documents is very similar. The "Seven Sacraments" are retained, but abuses connected with extreme unction are carefully restrained, and a marked distinction is drawn between Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance, and all other sacraments. The book was prepared by a Commission, which sat at Lambeth, under the presidency of Cranmer, and it was published in the name of the two archbishops, "and all other the bishops, prelates, and archdeacons of this realm," with the signatures of the archbishops, all the diocesan bishops, and twenty-five doctors. "But as it was neither passed by Convocation nor by Parliament, it had no other authority than could be given by the names of those who had signed it, and being printed at the King's Press." [1]

3. In 1543 there appeared a revised edition of this work, under the title of **The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.** Unlike its predecessor this work received the authority of Convocation, although the title-page contained a declaration that it was "set forth by the king's majesty of England," and the preface was from the pen of the "supreme head," whence the volume was commonly known as the King's Book. While much of the earlier is embodied in it, yet

[1] Dixon's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. p. 529. The Bishops' Book may be seen in *Formularies of Faith*, p. 21.

on a comparison of the two, the *reactionary* character of the King's Book is very clear. In many points a return to the old system of things is evident, as might be expected from a publication belonging to the later years of Henry's reign, when the Statute of the Six Articles (the "whip with six strings") was in force. The section exalting the Eucharist and Penance over the other sacraments is omitted. The doctrine of Transubstantiation is definitely maintained, although the word itself is avoided.[1] The section on extreme unction is rewritten, and the celibacy of the clergy is enforced.

Important as these three formularies of faith are, as marking the transitional character of the reign of Henry VIII., and the hesitating, gradual course of the doctrinal changes introduced, yet, for our present purpose, their importance is less than that of another document which was prepared in 1538, but never published nor in any way imposed upon the Church. While the works just considered enable us to see something of the *practical* system which our reformers had before them, and with which they were called upon to deal, yet it must be

[1] The Eucharist "among all the sacraments is of incomparable dignity and virtue, forasmuch as in the other sacraments the outward kind of the thing which is used in them remaineth still in their own nature and substance unchanged; but in this most high sacrament of the altar, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but, by the virtue of Christ's word in the consecration, be changed and turned to be the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ. So that, although there appear the form of bread and wine, after the consecration, as did before, and to the outward senses nothing seemeth to be changed, yet must we, forsaking and renouncing the persuasion of our senses in this behalf, give our assent only to faith, and to the plain word of Christ, which affirmeth that substance there offered, exhibited, and received, to be the very precious body and blood of our Lord, as is plainly written by the evangelists and also by St. Paul."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 262. The corresponding passage in the Bishop's Book is very different in tone and character (see p. 100).

noticed that no trace of their language can be found in our present series of Articles. For the source of these we must turn to a different quarter. In 1538 a small number of Lutheran divines from Germany were invited to this country by Henry, in order to confer with a committee of Anglican divines, and, if possible, draw up a joint Confession of Faith, with a view to the comprehension of both Anglicans and Lutherans in one communion. The invitation was accepted. A mixed committee met, under the presidency of Cranmer, to consider the subject. So long as the discussion was confined to matters of faith, agreement was arrived at with comparative ease. By the use of general terms, and (in some cases) designedly ambiguous formularies, it was found possible to compile a number of propositions which proved satisfactory to both parties. Thirteen Articles were thus prepared on the following subjects :—I. De unitate Dei et Trinitate Personarum. II. De Peccato Originali. III. De duabus Christi Naturis. IV. De Justificatione. V. De Ecclesia. VI. De Baptismo. VII. De Eucharistia. VIII. De Pœnitentia. IX. De Sacramentorum usu. X. De Ministris Ecclesiæ. XI. De Ritibus Ecclesiæ. XII. De Rebus Civilibus. XIII. De Corporum resurrectione et judicio extremo. Of these the first three are taken almost word for word from the Confession of Augsburg, the influence of which may be traced in other parts of the articles as well. But it is noteworthy that the sections on Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance are either entirely new or largely rewritten, while in that on the Use of Sacraments the language of the Lutheran Confession has been considerably strengthened, in order to emphasise the character of sacraments as channels of grace — apparently in order to satisfy the Anglican divines.

But, while agreement on the subjects mentioned was

secured with comparative ease, divergence of opinion was at once manifested when the committee passed from the consideration of doctrine to the discussion of questions connected with discipline. The summer was wasted in fruitless negotiations. The approach of winter led to the return of the Germans to their own land. Although a second mission was sent by them in the following year, nothing was done, and the scheme for a joint Confession of Faith seems to have been quietly allowed to drop. The Articles were not made public. They were not even submitted to Convocation, nor did they ever receive any sanction or authority whatever. Their importance however, historically, is very great, for they form the link between the Confession of Augsburg and our own Articles. A comparison of the three documents makes it perfectly clear that it was only through the medium of the Book of the Thirteen Articles that the Lutheran formulary influenced the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, from which our own are descended. "The expressions in Edward VI.'s formulary, usually adduced to prove its connection with the Confession of Augsburg, are also found in the Book of Articles, while it contains others which can be traced as far as the Book of Articles, but which will be sought for in vain in the Confession of Augsburg.'[1]

Before proceeding to the consideration of the Edwardian Series of Articles (the immediate predecessor of our own), it will be well to give a very brief notice of some of the doctrinal formularies issued on the Continent, a comparison with which may sometimes tend to throw light on the meaning of the Anglican statements.

The position of the Lutherans is shown by **the Con-**

[1] Jenkyns' *Cranmer*, I. xxiv., quoted in Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, p. 61. The Thirteen Articles may be seen in Hardwick, Appendix ii.

fession of Augsburg. This document contains an apologetic statement of their position, as distinct from that of both Romans and Zwinglians, on the special points of doctrine and practice at that time actually in controversy. It was originally drawn up by Melancthon, revised by Luther and others, and presented to the Emperor Charles v. at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530. It contains twenty-eight articles, and is divided into two parts: (1) On doctrine, comprising twenty-one articles; and (2) on ecclesiastical abuses, seven articles. As we have just seen, it was used by the framers of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and has through them influenced the English Articles. But since its influence on the Anglican formulary was only indirect, there is no necessity to give a fuller account of it here.[1]

A second Lutheran document to be noticed is **the Confession of Würtemberg.** This contains thirty-five articles. It was framed on the model of the Confession of Augsburg, and presented to the Council of Trent by the ambassadors of the State of Würtemberg, in 1552. It is mentioned here, because, as will be shown further on, it proved of considerable use to Archbishop Parker in the preparation of the Elizabethan Articles of 1563.[2]

Meanwhile, while the Lutherans were thus formulating their views, the Swiss and French reformers, who sympathised with the teaching of Zwingli and Calvin, were busy with the preparation of a number of documents expressing their views. Of these, it will be sufficient to mention the following:—The **Confessio Basiliensis**

[1] The Confession of Augsburg is contained in *Sylloge Confessionum*. For some account of it, see Schaff's *History of the (Lutheran) Reformation*, vol. ii. p. 706.

[2] For the Confession of Würtemberg (which is not given in the *Sylloge Confessionum*), see Le Plat, *Monumenta*, iv. 420.

(1534) and the **Confessio Helvetica I.** (1536), both of which are Zwinglian. The **Confessio Helvetica II.** (1564), which is largely influenced by Calvin. Still more strongly Calvinistic is the **Confessio Fidei Gallicana,** containing forty articles. This was apparently drawn up in 1559, and presented in the following year to Francis II. of France, and in 1561 to Charles IX. On the same lines is the **Confessio Belgica** of 1562 (containing thirty-seven articles), which obtained wide acceptance among the congregations of the "Reformed" in the Netherlands.[1] These documents, just enumerated, closely resemble each other, and are of a somewhat ambitious character, for they appear to be intended as complete schemes of theology, embracing the whole circle of Christian doctrine. It is needless to say that none of these compilations have the slightest connection with our own Articles. They are only mentioned here, because a comparison with them not seldom serves to bring out the marked contrast that there is between the unguarded and extravagant positions taken up by some of the foreign reformers, and the judicious moderation and wise avoidance of dogmatic assertions on points of small practical importance which may be observed in the English Articles.

The formal positions to which the Church of Rome committed herself at this period will be found in the **Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.** The Council first met in December 1545 in the pontificate of Paul III. By July 1547 ten sessions had been held. Shortly afterwards the Council was

[1] These Zwinglian and Calvinistic Confessions will all be found in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum.* For some account of the Swiss formularies, see Schaff's *History of the Swiss Reformation,* vol. i., p. 217 *seq.* No mention is made in the text of the Westminster Confession (1643), as it belongs to a somewhat different period.

suspended for some years. Its sittings were resumed by order of Julius III. in 1551, and between September 1551 and April 1553 six more sessions (xi.–xvi.) were held. The Council was then once more suspended, nor did it meet again until the Papacy of Pius IV.; sessions xvii.–xxv. being held in the course of the years 1562, 1563, and the final confirmation of the Council being dated January 26, 1564. It will appear from this enumeration of dates that Rome was stereotyping her doctrine just at the same time that the Church of England was revising her expression of it. Many of the same subjects were considered at Trent as in England. In some cases priority of treatment belongs to Rome, in others to England. It becomes, therefore, a matter of importance to ascertain in each case whether our reformers were confronted with the authoritative statements to which Rome was formally committed by her representatives at Trent, or whether they had before them merely the popular doctrine and the current practices. Thus, in regard to the number and authority of the canonical books, the subject was discussed at Trent during the fourth session of the Council in 1546. So also, in the earlier sessions held during 1546 and 1547, such subjects as original sin, justification, and the sacraments generally were considered, and canons concerning them were drawn up. On all these matters, therefore, it is obvious that the compilers of the Edwardian as well as of the Elizabethan Articles had the formal decisions of the Council before them. The Eucharist, Penance, and extreme unction were discussed in sessions xiii. and xiv., held in October and November 1551; thus, in this case, the decrees were issued while the Forty-Two Articles were in course of preparation but before their actual publication in 1553. The question of communion in both kinds was not considered by the Council till

session xxi. (July 1562), the sacrifice of the Mass in session xxii. (September 1562), and the doctrine of Purgatory, invocation of saints, adoration of images and relics not till the very last session of the Council held in December 1563, some months after the publication of the Elizabethan Articles. On all these matters, therefore, priority of treatment belongs to the Anglican formulary, and it is impossible to take its statements as intended to refer directly to the formal decrees of the Council of Trent. The so-called "Creed of Pope Pius IV." is of still later date, as it was only published in a bull dated November 13, 1564.

2. The Forty-Two Articles of 1553.

The subjects to be considered in this section may be divided thus:

(*a*) The history and authority of **the Forty-Two Articles.**

(*b*) Their object and contents.

(*c*) Their sources.

(*a*) *The history and authority of the Forty-Two Articles.*

The first draft of these was certainly the work of Archbishop Cranmer, the impress of whose mind they bear throughout. Edward VI. had come to the throne in 1547, but, though the liturgical reforms moved rapidly,[1] some time was suffered to elapse before the publication of any doctrinal as distinct from liturgical or homiletical[2] formulary. According to Strype,[3] in the year 1553 the King and his Privy Council ordered the archbishop to

[1] In 1548 was published the "Order of the Communion," an English form for communicating the people in both kinds. The first complete English Prayer Book followed in 1549, the English Ordinal was published in 1550, and in 1552 the first Prayer Book was superseded by "the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI."

[2] The first Book of the Homilies was published in 1547.

[3] *Cranmer*, bk. ii. ch. xxvii.

frame a book of articles of religion for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in this Church, that being finished they might be set forth by public authority. But at a still earlier date we find indications that a series of Articles had been framed by the archbishop and used by him as a test of orthodoxy.[1] This was in all probability "an early draft of the great formulary afterwards issued as the Forty-Two Articles."[2] By Cranmer they were submitted to other bishops for their revision and approval. In May 1552 they were laid before the Council. In September of the same year they were returned to the archbishop, who added the titles upon every matter, and sent them to Sir William Cecil and Sir John Cheke, the King's secretary and tutor. Shortly after this they were submitted to the six royal chaplains, "to make report of their opinions touching the same."[3] The MS. signed by the chaplains is happily

[1] On December 27, 1549, Hooper writes to Bullinger as follows:—"The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself. He has some articles of religion, to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a licence for teaching is not granted them; and in these his sentiments respecting the eucharist are pure and religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland."—See *Original Letters* (Parker Society), p. 71. The letter is wrongly dated "February 27" in Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, p. 72. Again, on February 5, 1550, Hooper writes to the same correspondent in almost identical terms: "The Archbishop of Canterbury, who is at the head of the King's Council, gives to all lecturers and preachers their licence to read and preach; every one of them, however, must previously subscribe to certain Articles, which if possible I will send you; one of which respecting the Eucharist is plainly the true one, and that which you maintain in Switzerland."—*Original Letters*, p. 76.

[2] Hardwick, p. 72. Hooper apparently took these Articles, and after modifying them in an arbitrary fashion to bring them more into harmony with his own opinions, offered them as a test to the clergy of his diocese at his visitations in 1551 and 1552.—See Dixon's *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 463.

[3] See Strype's *Cranmer*, bk. ii. ch. xxvii., and Hardwick, p. 73 *seq.*

still in existence, and enables us to see exactly the form which the documents had by this time reached.[1] The Articles are forty-five in number, that on the Eucharist, which afterwards appeared as XXIX., being broken up into four separate articles; and besides this difference of enumeration and division they differ in various other not unimportant particulars from the series as finally published. In November they were remitted to the archbishop, for "the last corrections of his pen and judgment." A few days later the document was returned to the Council, and on June 19, 1553, a mandate was issued in the King's name to the officials of the province of Canterbury, requiring subscription from all clergy, schoolmasters, and members of the university on admission to degrees.[2] This is really all that is known, for certain, of their history. But we find that the Articles thus offered for subscription in June 1553 had been issued to the public in English in the previous month. They were published at the press of R. Grafton, and bore the following title:—

"Articles agreed on by the bishops and other learned men in the Synod at London, in the year of our Lord God MDLII., for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a Godly concord in certain matters of religion."

[1] See Lemon's *Calendar of State Papers*, "Domestic," 1547-1580, p. 46. The Articles signed by the chaplains are printed in the last edition of Hardwick, Appendix iii. Mr. Dixon (*Reformation*, iii. p. 481 *seq.*) shows (after Dr. Lorimer) that the article on "The Book of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Church of England" (No. XXXV. in the published series, XXXVIII. in the original draft) was considerably modified after the Articles had been submitted to the chaplains, probably owing to the remonstrances of John Knox. "All that had appeared in the first draft on the subject of the *ceremonies* of the Prayer Book was cancelled, and nothing remained save what referred to the *doctrine* of the book, to which Knox had taken no exception."—Lorimer's *Knox in England*, p. 126.

[2] The mandate is given in Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 79; cf. Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, bk. ii. ch. xxii.

Two other editions were published shortly afterwards, in which the Articles were appended to a catechism that had previously been prepared.

1. An English edition, published by Day: "A short catechism or plain instruction, containing the sum of Christian learning, set forth by the king's majesty's authority, for all schoolmasters to teache. To this catechism are adjoined the articles agreed upon by the bishops and other learned and godly men, in the last convocation at London, in the year of our Lord MDLII., for to root out the discord of opinions and establish the agreement of true religion. Likewise published by the king's majesty's authority, 1553."

2. A Latin edition, published by Wolfe: "Catechismus Brevis Christianæ disciplinæ summam continens omnibus ludimagistris authoritate regia commendatus. Huic Catechismo adjuncti sunt articuli, de quibus in ultima Synodo Londinensi Anno Domini MDLII. ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem et consensum vere religionis firmandum inter Episcopos et alios eruditos atque pios viros convenerat: Regia similiter authoritate promulgati, 1553."

We now come to the consideration of the *authority* by which these Articles were imposed upon the Church. Had they really received the sanction of Convocation? The records of Convocation unfortunately perished in the great fire of London, and it is therefore impossible to appeal to them; but, even were they forthcoming, it is doubtful whether a reference to them would decide the question, for Fuller, who had the opportunity of examining them before their destruction, tells us that they were "but one degree above blanks, scarce affording the names of the clerks assembled therein."[1] To the same effect Heylin writes: "The Acts of this Convocation

[1] *Church History*, vol. ii. p. 400 (Ed. Nichols).

were so ill kept that there remains nothing on record touching their proceedings, except it be the names of such of the bishops as came thither to adjourn the house."[1] In the face of these statements it would appear that the acts of the Synod must either have been kept with culpable negligence, or that there was deliberate mutilation in the following reign. Whichever be the true explanation of the blank character of the records, it would appear that no help would be obtained from them were they still existing, for the solution of the question before us. We are left, then, to search for any evidence from other quarters which may throw light upon it.

On the one hand, it will be noticed that the authority of Convocation was claimed for the Articles in each of the three editions published, and that, where they are appended to the catechism, this authority is claimed for them alone, and not for the catechism. This latter is said, in the King's injunction prefixed to it, to have been "written by a certain godly and learned man," and committed to the examination of "certain bishops and other learned men, whose judgments we have in great estimation";[2] but not a word is said concerning its submission to the Synod, whereas, in each edition of the Articles, they are said to have been agreed upon in the Synod of 1552 (*i.e.* according to modern reckoning, 1553, as the year was then considered to begin on 25th March). At first sight, this fact might seem to be conclusive. But, on the other hand, there is no mention of the authority of Convocation in the royal letter requiring subscription, and grave doubts are thrown on the truth of the statement made in the title by what happened in the following reign. Early in the reign of

[1] *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. p. 256.

[2] See the *Liturgies of Edward VI.* (Parker Society), p. 485, where the Catechism and Articles will be found, both in Latin and in English.

Mary (October 1553), complaints were raised in Convocation, that the Catechism "bore the name of the honourable Synod, although put forth without their consent." The explanation given by Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, was that, though the house had no notice of "the articles of the Catechism, yet they might well bear the title of the Synod of London, since the house had given authority to certain persons to make ecclesiastical laws, and what was done by their authority was done by them." This must refer to the Commission which drew up the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (on which see below, § 2, *c.*), and, as Mr. Dixon says, "Certainly the appointing of that Commission had been asked for several times by Convocation, and it is probable that it was the working part of that Commission that made the Articles. But it was a stretch to argue from this as Philpot did."[1]

Still more startling is the explanation offered by Cranmer, at his disputation at Oxford in April 1554, when the charge was brought up against him, that he had "set forth a Catechism, in the name of the Synod of London, and yet there be fifty which, witnessing that they were of the number of the Convocation, never heard of this Catechism." In his reply to this, Cranmer disclaimed all responsibility for the title. "I was ignorant of the setting to of that title, and, as soon as I had knowledge thereof, I did not like it; therefore, when I complained thereof to the Council, it was answered me that the book was so entitled, because it was set forth in the time of the Convocation."[2] A more unsatisfactory explanation it is hard to conceive. But what makes it more remarkable is that, as we have seen, the Catechism, as distinct from the Articles, had never claimed the

[1] *Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 514.

[2] *Cranmer's Works*, vol. iv. pp. 64, 65 (Ed. Jenkyns).

authority of Convocation at all. And yet, in each case in which complaint is made in the reign of Mary, the terms of the complaint mention the Catechism, not the Articles; and the defenders of the title never deny, as we might have expected them to do, that the Catechism claimed synodal authority. The only possible explanation of this appears to be, that the whole book, containing the Articles as well as the Catechism, was known as "The Catechism,"[1] and that the objection really had reference to the Articles rather than the Catechism proper. If so, Philpot's expression, *the Articles of the Catechism*, was strictly accurate, and was intended to describe the Articles contained in the publication called and known as "The Catechism." If Cranmer's language may also be taken as referring to the Articles, then we are driven to the conclusion that, in spite of their title, they had never been submitted to Convocation at all, and that the title prefixed to them rested solely on the authority of the Privy Council, who must bear the blame of having set them forth with 'a deceitful title to impose upon the unwary vulgar.'[2]

This appears to be the most probable solution of the difficulty. But, at the same time, it cannot be denied that there is a certain amount of counter-evidence in support of the claim raised by the title, which prevents us from acquiescing in the explanation just given as *certain*.

[1] This view obtains some slight confirmation from the fact that the colophon at the close of the book, after the Articles and a few prayers, says "*These Catechisms* are to be sold, etc." It is also worth noticing that, in Elizabeth's reign, the Puritans were anxious to have a Catechism united to the Articles, "joined in one book, and by common consent to be authorised."—Strype, *Annals*, ii. p. 317 (Ed. 1725).

[2] Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 370. Mr. Dixon throws doubt on the statement that the book had been set forth in the time of the Convocation, and thinks that even this was untrue. —*Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 517.

1. "They are publicly recited as possessing such authority on their subsequent revival and enactment in the Convocation of 1563, and it appears almost incredible that these assumptions should have been allowed to pass unchallenged, more especially by prelates like Archbishop Parker,[1] in a critical Synod, if the document had not really been invested with the sanction which it claims."[2]

2. In a communication from the visitors to the Vice-Chancellor and Senate of Cambridge, dated 1st June 1553, the Articles are spoken of as having been prepared by good and learned men, and agreed upon *in the Synod of London.*

3. A letter from Sir John Cheke to Bullinger (June 7, 1553), mentions that *the Articles of the Synod at London* were published by royal mandate.

4. During the controversy on vestments, in the reign of Elizabeth, it was, says Archdeacon Hardwick, urged against the recalcitrant clergy, by an advocate of the party of order, that "many of their party had actually subscribed to the Edwardian formulary in the Convocation of 1553, and were accordingly bent on violating their own pledge, by breaking the traditions and ceremonies of the Church. The answer of the Puritan makes no attempt to throw discredit on this statement. He concedes that many of the disaffected clergy set their hands to the thirty-third of the Forty-Two Articles in common with the rest, but argued that they did so with the reservation that nothing was or ought to be commanded by the Church in contradiction to the word of God."[3]

[1] Parker had been appointed Dean of Lincoln in 1552, and was therefore himself a member of the Convocation of 1552-3.

[2] *Hardwick*, p. 109.

[3] *Ibid. loc. cit.* It does not appear quite certain that the subscription admitted is supposed to have taken place in the Synod. Subscription

The reader has now the evidence of both sides before him, and will see that the question is really a puzzling one, and cannot be decided offhand. On the whole, it appears to the present writer that the balance of evidence is *against* the correctness of the assertion made in the title. But he is free to confess that he cannot speak without some hesitation. It is possible that further evidence may yet be discovered, which will set the question at rest. In the meantime, we must be content with the statement that the Articles, as published in 1553, claimed the authority of Convocation, but that it is highly probable that the claim was not justified by facts.

(*b*) *The object and contents of the Forty-Two Articles.*

It is perfectly clear that these Articles—unlike some of the foreign Confessions—were never meant to form a complete system of theology, but were merely intended to treat of such points as were actually in dispute at the time. The title prefixed to the English edition speaks of them as agreed upon, "for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in *certain* matters of religion," and the title is so far entirely justified by their contents.[1] Their limitations and omissions are fatal to the view that they were designed to cover the whole field of Christian doctrine. Beyond the general statement of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in Article I., there is nothing in them on the Divinity of our Lord, nor is there any Article on

was required from all the clergy by royal mandate, and it is possible that the reference is to this. If so, although the passage would still testify to a belief, common to both parties in the controversy, that the Articles had actually passed Convocation, the value of its evidence would be considerably lessened, as there would be no admission by the disaffected clergy that they had actually subscribed *in the Convocation of* 1553.

[1] The Articles are printed in Latin and English at the close of this Introduction (see p. 70).

the Holy Spirit.[1] While the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is asserted in Article V., there is no account of the Canon of Holy Scripture, nor any enumeration of the canonical books.[2] Not a word is said of Confirmation or of Penance; and in many other matters there is a reticence which would be inexplicable, on any view except that which regards their range and extent as conditioned by present emergencies. They may be regarded as a two-edged sword, intended to smite with equal impartiality the errors to be found in two different directions—(1) those of the Medievalists, and (2) those of the Anabaptists.

1. Roman or medieval errors are expressly condemned in Article XII. (The teaching of the "school authors" on congruous merit), XIII. (Works of supererogation), XXIII. ("The doctrine of school-authors concerning purgatory, etc."), XXVI. (The doctrine of grace *ex opere operato*), XXIX. (Transubstantiation), XXX. (The sacrifices of masses); while Roman claims are rejected, or the position of the English Church in claiming liberty of independent action is defended, in such articles as XX. ("The Church of Rome hath erred, etc."), XXI. (It ought not to enforce anything beside Holy Scripture to be believed as an article of faith, cf. also Art. V.), XXII. (General Councils may err and have erred), XXV. ("It is most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God that in the congregation nothing be openly read or spoken in a tongue unknown to the people"), XXXI. ("Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded to vow the state of single life without marriage, neither by

[1] These omissions were supplied in 1563.

[2] Remedied in 1563. The omission in the Edwardian series of any account of the Canon, or of the position of the Apocrypha, is all the more remarkable as the Tridentine Decree on the Canon had been already drawn up.

God's law are they compelled to abstain from matrimony"), XXXIII. (On "Traditions of the Church"), XXXV. ("Of the Book of Prayers and ceremonies of the Church of England"), XXXVI. ("The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England").

2. On the other hand it is probable that to a still greater extent the Articles were conditioned by the errors of the *Anabaptists*, who were rapidly bringing the whole Reformation movement into serious discredit by their wild extravagances and the utter defiance and repudiation of all authority, whether civil or ecclesiastical, of which they were guilty. These fanatics took their name from their practice of *re-baptizing* those who joined them, having been previously baptized in infancy. But their errors were far from being confined to the single point of the rejection of infant baptism. Indeed, it is hard to find a heresy or erroneous opinion which may not be laid to the charge of some among them. How serious was the danger, and what was the character of the false teaching which they were propagating in this country, may be seen from a letter written by Bishop Hooper shortly before the preparation of the Forty-Two Articles:—

"The Anabaptists flock to the place, and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the incarnation of our Lord; for they deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, according to the flesh. They contend that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin. They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin. They maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and beside that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will, by

which he altogether acts under some kind of necessity. Although I am unable to satisfy their obstinacy, yet the Lord by His word shuts their mouths, and their heresies are more and more detested by the people. How dangerously our England is afflicted by heresies of this kind, God only knows; I am unable indeed from sorrow of heart to express to your piety. There are some who deny that man is endued with a soul different from that of a beast, and subject to decay. Alas, not only are these heresies reviving among us, which were formerly dead and buried, but new ones are springing up every day. There are such libertines and wretches, who are daring enough in their conventicles not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world. On the other hand, a great portion of the kingdom so adheres to the popish faction, as altogether to set at nought God and the lawful authority of the magistrates; so that I am greatly afraid of a rebellion and civil discord."[1]

To the same effect another of Bullinger's correspondents, Martin Micronius, writes on August 14, 1551:—

"We have not only to contend with the Papists, who are almost everywhere ashamed of their errors, but much more with the Sectaries and Epicureans and pseudo-Evangelicals. In addition to the ancient errors respecting pædo-baptism, the incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the lawfulness of an oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, new ones are rising up every day, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's divinity are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our churches with greater violence than ever,

[1] Original letters (Parker Society), p. 65. The letter is dated June 25, 1549.

as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin."[1]

As a safeguard against the errors of fanatics, such as those thus described, even more perhaps than against the errors of medievalists, it was found necessary to issue the Articles. Although the Anabaptists are actually mentioned by name in but two of the Articles, namely, VIII. (On original sin), and XXXVII. (" Christian men's goods are not common "), they are undoubtedly the persons alluded to in Article VI (" They are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises"), XIV., XV. (" They are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, etc."), XVIII. (" They also are to be had accursed and abhorred that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, etc."), XIX. (" They are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, etc."). In each of these articles there is evidently a definite set of persons contemplated who were propagating the views condemned; and in each case we find that the objectionable tenet was one which was maintained by some among the Anabaptists. Further, Anabaptist opinions account for the language of Article XXIV. (" It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same,"), XXVII. (" The wickedness of the ministers doeth not away the effectual operation of God's ordinances "), XXVIII. (" The custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church "), XXXII. (" Excommunicate persons are to be avoided "), XXXIII. (" Whosoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the

[1] *Ibid.* p. 574. Both letters are quoted in Hardwick, p. 88 *seq.*

word of God, and be ordained, and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as one that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren "), XXXVI. ("The civil magistrate is ordained and allowed of God; wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience sake. The civil laws may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for Christians, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and to serve in lawful wars "), XXXVIII. (" Christian men may take an oath "), XXXIX. (" The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass "), XL. (" The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with their bodies, nor sleep idly "), XLI. (" Heretics called Millenarii ") XLII. (" All men shall not be saved at the length "). And even in those articles which might be thought to be less directly polemical, such as I. to IV., and VII. (On the Creeds), there can really be no doubt that the danger of Anabaptism was present to the compilers. It was owing to the spread of the errors of these fanatics that it became absolutely necessary to re-state the fundamental articles of the faith, and the Church's adherence to the traditional Creeds of Christendom, for many of the Anabaptists " abandoned every semblance of belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and so passed over to the Arian and Socinian schools, then rising up in Switzerland, in Italy, and in Poland." [1]

This brief review of the object and contents of the Forty-Two Articles will be sufficient to show that in the first instance the document must have been merely intended to be a provisional and temporary one. Every line of it bears witness to this. The idea that

[1] Hardwick, p. 86.

it would be maintained as a permanent test of orthodoxy cannot have ever occurred to its authors. For such a purpose it is singularly ill-suited. Many of the articles are purely negative, condemning in trenchant terms some existing error, but not attempting to define the positive truth opposed to it. Our review will also indicate how utterly mistaken is the notion that the Articles were mainly, if not exclusively, designed as a safeguard against Rome, for we have seen that, although a considerable number of the articles do condemn Roman and medieval errors, yet a far larger number are directed against the teaching of the Anabaptists, and denounce false doctrines in terms to which the most ardent Romanist could not take exception.

(*c.*) *The Sources of the Forty-two Articles.*

When the Anglican formulary of 1553 is compared with the Confession of Augsburg (1530), it is immediately apparent that the later document is indebted to the earlier one. The similarity between some of the articles is so marked that the Lutheran Confession may be unhesitatingly set down as their ultimate source. But it is tolerably certain that the debt is only *indirect*, nor is there any reason to think that the Augsburg Confession itself was actually used by Cranmer and his colleagues in the preparation of the English Articles. The clauses common to both are *all* found also in the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and other language in the Forty-Two Articles is also traced to this document, and not to Augsburg. Even so, the debt to Lutheranism is but a limited one. The correspondence of language is confined almost entirely to Articles I., II., XXIII., XXVI., XXVII., XXXII., *i.e.* to the articles on the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Ministry, the Sacraments, and Traditions of the Church. On the burning question of justification and all kindred subjects, where correspondence might well be looked for,

it is remarkable that it is sought in vain. On all these topics, which were among the principal subjects of debate in the early days of the Reformation—questions which concern the condition of man, and the means of his salvation—our reformers took an independent line of their own, which differs in a very marked way from the line taken at Augsburg. Nor should it be forgotten that in some of the matters in which indebtedness to the Lutheran formulary cannot be denied, the Anglican statements are far stronger and more precise than those to which the Lutherans were called on to subscribe, *e.g.* on the Sacraments, the Confession of Augsburg said that they were instituted, "not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather to be signs and witnesses of God's goodwill towards us, offered to quicken and confirm faith in those who use them." In the Thirteen Articles of 1538 this was altered into the statement "that sacraments instituted by the word of God are not only marks of profession among Christians, but rather *certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace* and God's goodwill towards us, *by which God works invisibly in us* . . . . and through them faith is quickened and confirmed in those who use them."[1]

[1] "De usu Sacramentorum docent quod Sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita."—*Conf. August.* xiii.

"Docemus quod Sacramenta quæ per verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint notæ professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quædam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ et bonæ voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quæ Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his qui eis utuntur."—Thirteen Articles of 1538, No. IX.

"Sacramenta per verbum Dei instituta non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat."—Forty-Two Articles of 1553, No. XXV.

This is much more emphatic than the language of Augsburg, and it is remarkable that it was retained by Cranmer in 1553, when his views on the sacraments had considerably changed from what they were fifteen years previously. The result of the retention of these words is to bring Article XXVI., in which they occur, into rather startling contrast with Article XXIX. The two articles really belong to different dates, and harmonise ill together, for whereas the earlier passage taken from the Thirteen Articles of 1538 describes the position of sacraments of the gospel as channels of grace in terms which leave nothing to be desired, the Twenty-Ninth Article of 1553 reflects the opinion to which Cranmer was committed at a later date when he had fallen under the influence of John a Lasco, and its teaching on the presence in the Eucharist, if not actually Zwinglianism, is perilously near to it. Happily, as will be pointed out further on in the introduction, the changes made in this article in Elizabeth's reign have altered its character, and by the removal of the objectionable clause, and the substitution of another for it, have brought it into harmony with the teaching of Article XXV. (= XXVI. of 1553).

During the years in which the Forty-Two Articles were being shaped, another work was also in course of preparation (probably by the very same men to whom the Articles are due), viz. the **Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.** The exact relation of this to the Articles is hard to determine. That a relation of some sort exists is perfectly clear, the wording of many passages being identical, or nearly so. But it is not easy to decide which document can claim priority. As early as 1532 mention is made of a design for the reform of the ecclesiastical laws, but it is uncertain whether anything was actually done before the reign of Edward VI. In 1549 an Act of Parliament was passed empowering the King,

by the advice of his Council, to appoint thirty-two persons "to compile such ecclesiastical laws as should be thought by him, his Council, and them, convenient to be practised in all the spiritual courts of the realm." Two years elapsed before any such persons were nominated. But in 1551 two commissions were issued, the one to thirty-two persons, as provided in the Act of 1549, the other to a smaller number of divines, by whom the actual work was to be done, as the full commission of thirty-two was apparently considered too large. The authors of the code, as it finally appeared, were Cranmer, Goodrich, Cox, Peter Martyr, May, Rowland Taylor, John Lucas, and Richard Goodrick. The work was completed early in 1553. Cranmer was, however, unable to obtain the sanction of Parliament for it before the death of the King in the summer of the same year. Thus the scheme fell to the ground, and although the volume was subsequently printed during the reign of Elizabeth, the revised code of ecclesiastical law was never imposed upon the Church by any authority whatsoever. Its interest, then, is purely historical. But, regarded as a contemporary exposition of the Articles, and as either furnishing one of the sources from which they were drawn, or as containing an expanded version of some of them, parts of the work are of the highest value. The first two sections are headed, "De summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," and "De Hæresibus." In these the passages corresponding with the Articles occur, and it will frequently be found that, being in a fuller and more amplified form, they supply exactly what is wanting to enable us to determine the exact drift of the more condensed statements of the Articles, or they indicate precisely the quarter from which the errors condemned in the Articles were proceeding.[1]

[1] For the history of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, see Dixon, vol. iii. 350 *seq.*

3. The Elizabethan Articles.

It will be convenient once more to subdivide the subject before us, and distribute it under the following headings:—

(*a*) The history of the revision of 1563.

(*b*) The character of the revision, and comparison of the Elizabethan with the Edwardian Articles.

(*c*) The final revision in 1571.

(*a*) *The history of the revision of* 1563.—It would appear that during the reign of Mary (1553–1558) no notice whatever was taken of the Forty-Two Articles. As they had never been enjoined by Parliament, there was no necessity for an Act to repeal them. Consequently they were quietly dropped. Nor were they immediately revived on the accession of Elizabeth. For some time after this Archbishop Parker provided, on his own authority, an independent test, consisting of eleven articles, which all the clergy were required to read publicly, not only on entry into any cure, but also twice in the course of every year.[1] But when Convocation met, at the beginning of 1563, one of the first works undertaken by it was a revision of the Edwardian Articles, with a view to their revival in a modified form. This resulted in the publication of the **Thirty-Eight Articles of 1563.** Even before the meeting of the Synod, Archbishop Parker, aided probably by Guest, Bishop of Rochester, had been at work on the Articles; and there still exists among the MSS. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, a copy of the Latin Articles as presented by him to the Synod, with the signatures of the bishops who subscribed this document on January 29, after further alterations had been introduced by them.[2] By the

[1] See Strype, *Eccl. Annals*, vol. i. p. 218.

[2] A copy of this, with a facsimile of the signatures, is printed in Lamb's *Historical Account of the Thirty-Nine Articles.* Among those whose sig-

help of this paper it is possible to discover exactly which of the changes were made by Parker in his preparatory revision, and which are to be assigned to the bishops during the passage of the Articles through Convocation. From the Upper House they passed on February 5 to the Lower, and were signed by the members of that house. They were then laid before the Queen in Council, and published in Latin by Wolfe, the royal printer, under the direct authority of the Queen herself. But it is remarkable that this published copy differs in two important particulars from the MS. as signed by the bishops on January 29th.

(1) It prefixes to Article XX. the affirmative clause; "Habet ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis autoritatem," which now makes its appearance for the first time.

(2) It omits Article XXIX.: "De manducatione Corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare." This article, to which there is nothing corresponding in the Edwardian series, had been added by Parker, and apparently accepted by the Synod, as it is in the MS. copy to which the signatures of the bishops are attached.

The detailed examination of the questions that arise in connection with these changes is reserved for the commentary on the Articles in question. It will be sufficient to say here that both alterations were probably due to the Queen herself, and that they were made after

natures are attached to this document are the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Chester. "Though the Northern Convocation as a body had no direct influence in the compiling of the Articles, its concurrence was, to some extent, implied in the signature of the Archbishop of York and his two suffragans. In 1605 all doubts and scruples on this question were set at rest by the formal acceptance of the Articles in the Convocation of York."—Hardwick, p. 140.

the Articles had passed the Lower as well as the Upper House of Convocation. They were therefore wanting in synodical authority, and rested simply on the authority of the Sovereign, as "supreme governor." The object of the addition of the affirmative clause to Article XX. was to assert in strong terms the rights and powers of the Church, with an eye to the position taken up by the Puritan party, who were denying to her the power to decree any rites and ceremonies, save such as could claim direct support from Holy Scripture. The omission of Article XXIX. was probably due to tenderness to the Roman party, and a desire, if possible, to embrace them within the limits of the National Church.

(*b*) *The character of the revision and comparison of the Articles of* 1563 *with those of* 1553.

The following conspectus of the principal changes introduced in 1563 will enable the reader to see without difficulty the importance of the revision, and the very real difference in tone and character that exists between the Elizabethan Articles and those of Edward's reign. Italics are used to denote the alterations made by Archbishop Parker in his preliminary work before he submitted the Articles to the Synod. Those made by the bishops are indicated by ordinary roman type; thick black letters being used for the two subsequent changes mentioned above as probably due to the Queen herself.

1. Additions.

A. Four New Articles, viz.—

Art. V. *Of the Holy Ghost.*
„ XII. *Of good works.*
„ XXIX. *Of the wicked, which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.* [**Omitted before publication;** restored in 1571.]
„ XXX. *Of both kinds.*

B. Clauses in other Articles.

Art. II. "*Begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.*"

„ VI. *The clauses on the Canon of Scripture with the list of the canonical books of the Old Testament, and specimens of the Apocrypha.*

„ VII. *The clause on the Ceremonial and the Moral Law.* ("Although the law given from God by Moses . . . . the commandments which are called moral." This clause was drawn from the Nineteenth Article of 1553.)

„ VIII. "*And believed.*"

„ X. "*The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.*

„ XVII. "*In Christ.*"

„ XX. **"The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith."**

„ XXV. *The two clauses on the number of the sacraments, and the five rites, commonly called Sacraments.*

„ XXVII. "*Overthroweth the nature of a sacrament.*"

"*The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner: and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.*"

Art. XXXIII. "*Every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.*"

„ XXXVII. *The explanation of the royal supremacy.* ("Where we attribute to the Queen's majesty . . . . restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.")

2. Omissions.

A. Seven complete Articles, viz.:—

Art. X. *Of grace.*

„ XVI. *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.*

„ XIX. *All men are bound to keep the commandments of the Moral Law.* (Though this was omitted as a separate article, part of it was embodied in Article VII. of the revised series. See above.)

„ XXXIX. The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass.

„ XL. The souls of them that depart this life do not die with the bodies nor sleep idly.

Art. XLI. *Heretics called Millenarii.*

„ XLII. All men shall not be saved at length.

B. Clauses in other Articles.

Art. III. "For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection, but his ghost departing from him was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.

„ VI. "*Although it be sometimes received of the faithful as godly and profitable for an order and comeliness.*"

„ IX. "*Which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew.*"

„ XVII. "*Though the decrees of predestination are unknown to us.*"

„ XXV. "*Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people with sacraments, most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*"

"*And yet that not of the work wrought* [ex opere operato], *as some men speak, which word, as it is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture, so it engendereth no godly but a very superstitious sense.*"

Art. XXVIII. "*Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place: therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as Holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*"[1]

„ XXXVII. "*The Civil Magistrate is ordained and allowed of God: wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience' sake.*"

[1] Parker, in his preliminary revision, omitted this clause, but substituted for it the following, which was rejected by the Synod: "Christus in cœlum ascendens, corpori suo immortalitatem dedit, Naturam non abstulit; humanæ enim naturæ veritatem (juxta Scripturas) perpetuo retinet, quam uno et definito loco esse, et non in multa, vel omnia simul loca diffundi oportet. Quum igitur Christus in cœlum sublatus, ibi usque ad finem seculi sit permansurus, atque inde, non aliunde (ut loquitur Augustinus) venturus sit, ad judicandum vivos et mortuos, non debet quisquam fidelium, carnis ejus, et sanguinis, realem et corporalem (ut loquuntur) presentiam in Eucharistia vel credere, vel profiteri."

3. Substitutions and Other Changes.

A. Articles rewritten.

Art. XI. *Of the justification of man.*

„ XXIV. *Of speaking in the congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.*

„ XXXII. *Of the marriage of priests.*

„ XXXV. *Of homilies.*

„ XXXVI. *Of consecration of bishops and ministers.*

B. Other Changes.

Art. XXII. "*The Romish doctrine*" (doctrina Romanensium) was substituted for "the doctrine of school authors."

„ XXV. *The order of the clauses was reversed.*

„ XXVII. *The clause on Infant Baptism was rewritten.*

„ XXXVII. *The first paragraph was rewritten.* ("The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her Dominions, and unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes, doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction," was substituted for "The King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland.")

Of several of the additions made by Parker the source is to be found in the Confession of Würtemberg. From this is taken verbatim the clause in Article II. concerning the Divine Nature of the Son; the Fifth Article ("Of the Holy Ghost"), and the statement concerning the canonical books of the Old and New Testament in Article VI.; while the additional clause in Article X., the re-written Article XI., and the new Article XII. ("On good works"), as well as the affirmative clause in Article XX., are obviously suggested by it.

We are now in a position to consider the significance and object of the changes thus introduced.

1. *A character of greater completeness, as regards "fundamentals," was given to the formulary, and some changes were introduced, seemingly in order to make the document suitable for a permanent test of doctrinal orthodoxy.*

It was probably for this reason that the clause on the Divinity of the Son in Article II. was introduced, as well as the new Fifth Article on the Holy Spirit. To the same cause we may trace the excision of the reference to the Anabaptists in Article IX., and the total omission of Articles XXXIX.–XLII., on speculative points which had been raised by some among the Anabaptists. Apparently, the erroneous teaching had either disappeared or was regarded as less formidable, and therefore, in a document designed for permanent use, it was thought well to remove the reference to it. Under the same head notice may be taken of the omission of the reference to 1 Pet. iii. 18 in Article III., and of the Sixteenth Article, defining the nature of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. These omissions may have been due to the desire for comprehension, and willingness to allow room for divergence of opinion in regard to difficult and disputed texts. But, although the Elizabethan Articles were thus rendered

more complete than those issued in 1553, it remains true that even so they cannot be regarded as a complete scheme of doctrine. Many important matters of faith are omitted in them; and, in order to arrive at the mature judgment of the Church of England it is frequently necessary to have recourse to the Prayer-Book, and to supplement the partial and fragmentary teaching of the Articles by it. The statement already made in reference to the Edwardian Articles holds good of these also. Many of them are purely negative, condemning some erroneous view, and telling us what not to hold, but stopping short without any expression of the true doctrine on the subject, as opposed to the error rejected. Bishop Pearson's words, quoted in this connection by Archdeacon Hardwick, are substantially true. The Book of the Articles "is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explication of all Christian doctrines necessary to be taught, but an enumeration of some truths, which upon and since the Reformation have been denied by some persons; who upon their denial are thought unfit to have any cure of souls in this Church or realm, because they might, by their opinions, infect their flock with error, or else disturb the Church with schism, or the realm with sedition."[1]

2. *The Catholic position of the Church of England, and her determination to adhere to the general teaching of the Church was made clearer.*

This is seen in the alterations made in Article XI., and the introduction of Article XII. ("On good works"), which render the teaching on the justification of man less open to objection. Still more is it evidenced by the alterations introduced into the sacramental articles. Especially noteworthy is the omission of the clause in Article XXVIII., which denied the "real and bodily

[1] *Minor Works*, vol. ii. p. 215, quoted in Hardwick, p. 158.

presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament." In place of this was introduced the clause stating that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, intended, according to Bishop Guest who says that it was "of mine own penning," "not to deny the reality of the presence of the body of Christ in the Supper, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof."[1] It will also be noticed that the clause denying the theory of grace *ex opere operato*, was omitted from Article XXV., and that the language on infant baptism in Article XXVII. was strengthened, while that in XXXVII. ("On the royal supremacy") is of a much more sober and guarded character than the bald statement of the corresponding Article in the Edwardian series.

3. *On the other hand, the independent line taken by the Church of England in the matters of dispute with Rome was adhered to, and in some respects more sharply defined than had been the case in the earlier Articles.*

As instances of this, reference may be made to the additions to Article VI. (On the canonical books, and the position of the Apocrypha), the addition to XXV. (On the number of sacraments ordained of Christ, and the rejection of the claim of the "five rites" to be regarded as having the like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Eucharist), the addition of XXX. (On the denial of the cup to the laity), the vindication of the rights of National Churches in XXXIII., and of the character of the English ordinal in XXXVI. The substitution of "Romanensium"

[1] See further in the commentary on Article XXVIII. It will not be forgotten that a few years earlier (in 1559) the Elizabethan divines had struck out from the Prayer-Book the "black rubric" which appears to deny the "real and spiritual presence" of Christ's blood, and had restored the use of the first clause ("the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.") in the administration of the elements, as well as of the eucharistic vestments.

for "Scholasticorum" in XXII. marked the intention of the Article to condemn a present current form of teaching rather than the more formal statements of scholastic divines. And while the withdrawal of Article XXIX. before publication, as well as the excision of the clause referred to above on grace *ex opere operato*, betrays a desire not to create unnecessary differences with Rome on matters of doctrine, where there might be room for difference of opinion, the rewriting of Articles XXIV. and XXXII. manifested a determination to speak out plainly on practical matters, where it was considered that plain speaking was necessary.

4. *Changes affecting the position of the Puritan*[1] *party.*

There is no doubt that the change in Article XXVIII., involving the omission of the clause denying the real presence was most distasteful to them,[2] nor can the addition of the affirmative clause to Article XX. have been altogether agreeable, though their objections to it were not raised till later. They were not altogether satisfied with Article XXXIII., as a considerable number of members of the Lower House of Convocation were anxious that these words in it might be mitigated. "Is

[1] The name of Puritan may well be given to them, though, as a matter of history, it was not used till the following year. Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* ii. p. 540) notes, under the year 1564, that the name first began in this year, and characteristically adds that "the grief had not been great, if it had ended in the same."

[2] Humphrey and Sampson sent to Bullinger in July 1566 a list of "some blemishes which still attach to the Church of England," and among them they note the following :—"The free liberty of preaching is taken away from the ministers of Christ, those who now are willing to preach are forbidden to recommend any innovation with regard to rites, but all are obliged to give their assent to ceremonies by subscribing their hands. Lastly, the article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the real presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect."—*Zurich Letters* (Parker Society), vol. i. p. 165.

ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, quique lædit authoritatem magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeantur, arguendus est."[1] The clause had stood without question in the Edwardian Articles, and, in spite of the request of the Puritan party, was left intact. On the other hand it is possible that the tenth of the series of 1553 was omitted out of tenderness to the rising Calvinism of the party, and that for the same reason the first clause was added to our present Article X.

5. There remain a limited number of changes which cannot well be classified under any of the foregoing heads. Of these some were made in order to bring the English into closer conformity with the Latin.[2] For others it is not easy to state the precise reason which called for them. None of them, however, are of any great importance.

(*c*) *The final revision of* 1571.—The Articles passed by Convocation and approved by the Crown in 1563 underwent a further revision in 1571. Up till this date, although the Articles had been signed by members of Convocation, subscription was not required from the clergy of the Church in general; and the Queen steadily resisted every attempt made to submit them to Parliament. When, however, the Anglo-Roman schism had been brought about by the publication of the papal bull, excommunicating the Queen in 1570, it would seem that her reluctance to call in the aid of Parliament in enforcing subscription

[1] Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. p. 336.

[2] The Parker MS., signed by the bishops, is, it will be remembered, in Latin, as is also the authoritative edition published by Wolfe. But English MSS. of the Articles dating from 1563 still remain among the Elizabethan *State Papers* ("Domestic," vol. xxvii. §§ 40, 41), one of which is endorsed "Articles of Religion agreed on, 1562, in the Convocation House," and at least two English editions of the Articles were printed by Jugge and Cawood.

was somewhat relaxed, and in the session of 1571 an Act was passed requiring all clergy, who had been ordained by any form except that in the English Prayer-Book of Edward VI. or Elizabeth, to subscribe to "all the Articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted, entituled, *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God* 1562, *according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding the diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion; put forth by the Queen's authority.*" The Act was evidently due to the Anglo-Roman schism, and was intended primarily to enforce subscription on those who had been ordained during the reign of Mary. But it also provided that, for the future, "the said Articles" were to be subscribed by all candidates for ordination, and by every person admitted to any benefice with cure of souls.[1]

Thus, for the first time, subscription to the Articles was required by statute law, and until quite recent times this Act of the 13th of Elizabeth was the only one that could be quoted as enforcing it on all the clergy.[2] This is the more remarkable when it is considered—(1) that the edition of the Articles contemplated in the Act was the English edition, printed in 1563, by Jugge and Cawood, which contained neither the

[1] 13 Elizab. c. xii., "An Act to reform certain disorders touching ministers of the Church." See Strype, *Annals*, vol. ii. p. 71, and Prothero's *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 64.

[2] The Act of Uniformity of 1662 was concerned with the Prayer-Book and not the Articles—only incidentally requiring subscription to the latter from all *lecturers*. The Articles, it must be remembered, form no part of the Book of Common Prayer, though in modern times generally bound up with it.

Twenty-ninth Article nor the affirmative clause of Article XX; (2) that the terms of the Act were ingeniously drawn, so as to enforce subscription to *some* only of the Articles, for it is clear that the restrictive word, "only," was inserted in the interests of the Puritan party, and intended to relieve them from the necessity of subscribing those Articles which were concerned with discipline as distinct from doctrine; and (3) that, without any reference whatever to the action of Parliament, the Articles were revised by Convocation, and that, from that day to this, subscription has been required on the authority of the Church to *all* the Articles, and to that form of them which was finally accepted by Convocation. Such facts are very significant, and those who maintain that the Church of England is an "Act of Parliament Church" would do well to ponder them.

The Bill referred to above was introduced into the Commons on 7th April, transmitted to the Lords on 3rd May, passed its third reading on the 21st, and obtained the royal assent on the 29th of the same month. On the very day on which it was read the first time in the House of Commons, we find Parker requiring subscription from all members of the Lower House of Convocation, who had not formerly subscribed; and early in May there are signs that a revision of the Articles was taken in hand, and that some alterations and emendations were in contemplation. On 4th May the bishops were secretly considering the Articles, and came to the conclusion "that when the Book of Articles touching doctrine shall be fully agreed upon, that then the same shall be put in print by the appointment of my Lord of Sarum [Jewel], and a price rated for the same to be sold." On 11th May the bishops were again deliberating, and on that day Parker and ten other bishops

(including Guest of Rochester) signed an English MS. containing the Twenty-ninth Article, but omitting the affirmative clause of Article XX.[1] After this, further deliberation must have taken place, although no record of them is now forthcoming. We only know that the bishops gave up the Book of the Articles to the Queen's Majesty "to peruse them and judge them,"[2] and that **the Thirty-Nine Articles** were finally published in Latin and English with the royal ratification attached to them, which plainly declared the assent of Convocation to them.

"This Book of the Articles before rehearsed is again approved and allowed to be holden and executed within the realm, by the assent and consent of our Sovereign Lady ELIZABETH, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, etc. Which Articles were deliberately read and confirmed

[1] See Hardwick, p. 150 *seq.*

[2] Among the *State Papers* ("Domestic," Elizabeth, vol. lxxviii. No. 37) is an (unsigned) document addressed to Cecil, in Bishop Guest's handwriting, suggesting the introduction of various alterations in the Articles before their final ratification. The Articles which he wished to have modified were the seventeenth, in which he suggests the omission of the words "by His counsel secret to us," on the ground that Ephesians i. really reveals God's counsel. Further, he would have the last paragraph of this article altered, because part of it is not clearly expressed, and part might be thought to countenance the notion of a secret will of God opposed to His revealed one. In Article XXV. he criticises the paragraph on the "five rites commonly called Sacraments," which he wishes to have altered. In XXVIII. he suggests—(1) the omission of the word "only" in the clause, "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and (2) the addition of "profitably" to the following clause, "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received, etc."; while he urges very strongly that Article XXIX. should not be confirmed and authorised. The paper was quite ineffectual, as none of the changes suggested by him were made. The latter part of the document is quoted in Mr. G. F. Hodge's *Bishop Guest—Articles XXVIII. and XXIX.* where, however, a wrong reference to the volume of *State Papers* is given. It should be not lxxv. 36, but (as above) lxxviii. 37.

again by the subscription of the hands of the archbishops and bishops of the Upper House, and by the subscription of the whole clergy of the Nether House in their Convocation, in the year of our Lord 1571."[1]

The changes introduced before the Articles were thus ratified and published include the restoration of Article XXIX., and the addition of the *complete* list of the books of the Apocrypha in Article VI. The affirmative clause of Article XX. was apparently ratified by the Synod, and various other minor alterations were introduced. "They are either emendations in the wording of thirteen titles, or corrections introduced into the English form of the older Latin copy, or occasional explanations of phraseology believed to have been capable of misconstruction," but they "left the character impressed upon the Articles of 1563 entirely unaffected."[2] The fact that the Articles, as thus revised, were published in both Latin and English, with the royal ratification attached to them, suggests the inquiry, which of the two versions is to be considered the most authoritative; and in answer to this we cannot do better than follow the example of Archdeacon Hardwick in quoting some words of Daniel Waterland, which sum up in a convenient form all that there is to be said on the subject.

"As to the Articles, English and Latin, I may just observe, for the sake of such readers as are less acquainted with these things—*First*, That the Articles were passed, recorded, and ratified in the year 1562, and *in Latin only*. *Secondly*, That those Latin Articles were revised and corrected by the Convocation of 1571. *Thirdly*, That an authentic English translation was then made of the Latin Articles by the same Convocation,

[1] The ratification still stands at the close of the Articles as they are printed in modern Prayer-Books.

[2] Hardwick, p. 155.

and the Latin and English adjusted as nearly as possible. *Fourthly*, That the Articles thus prepared *in both languages* were published the same year, and by the royal authority. *Fifthly*, Subscription was required the same year to the English Articles, called the Articles of 1562, by the famous Act of the 13th of Elizabeth.

These things considered, I might justly say, with Bishop Burnet, that the Latin and English are both *equally authentical*. Thus much, however, I may certainly infer, that if in any places the English version be ambiguous, where the Latin original is clear and determinate, the Latin ought to fix the more doubtful sense of the other (as also *vice versa*), it being evident that the Convocation, Queen, and Parliament, intended the same sense in both."[1]

4. The Royal Declaration.

Since 1571 no change whatever has been made in the text of the Thirty-Nine Articles. But, as they stand in modern prayer-books, there is prefixed to them a document entitled "**His Majesty's Declaration,**" of which some account must now be given.

By the time of the accession of Charles the First (1625), the school of churchmen, of which Bishop Andrews is the best and most famous representative,[2] had begun to rise into power. The publication of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of Richard Hooker[3] may be

[1] "Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription Considered," *Works*, vol. ii. p. 316; quoted in Hardwick, p. 156.

[2] On the position of Andrews and his school, see Dean Church's essay on Andrews, in *Masters in English Theology*, p. 88, *seq.*

[3] The first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* were published in 1593, and the fifth came out by itself in 1597; the three remaining books were published posthumously, as they were incomplete when Hooker died in 1600.

said to mark the beginnings of the reaction against the dominant Calvinism of the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. Since then the position of the "Arminian"[1] party had become much more definite. Instead of merely standing upon the defensive, they were beginning to carry the war into the enemy's country, and attack the interpretation which the Calvinistic party, with an entire disregard of history, had fastened upon the Articles and formularies of the Church. The attention of the country in general was called to the subject by the appearance of Richard Montague's *New Gag for an Old Goose* in 1622. Montague was at this time a simple parish priest, and his work was intended as a reply to a Roman attack upon the Church of England, entitled *The Gag for the New Gospel*, which assumed that the popular Calvinistic theology of the day truly represented the accepted doctrine of the Church of England. To this position Montague offered an uncompromising opposition, and, "as far as the matter of his volume is concerned," it may be described as "a temperate exposition of the reasons which were leading an increasing body of scholars to reject the doctrines of Rome and Geneva alike."[2] Complaints of the book were raised in the House of Commons, and the matter was referred to Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Montague was summoned to Lambeth, and admonished; but instead of yielding to the primate's advice, returned home to follow up his first work by a second, the famous *Appello Cæsarem*, in which he "indicated more fiercely than before his claim to be the true exponent of the doctrine

[1] It is difficult to know by what term to describe the party. "High Churchmen" is an anachronism, as the word had not yet come into use. "Arminian" was the term (most unfairly) applied to them by their opponents. It is therefore employed in the text.

[2] S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. v. p. 352.

of the Church."[1] The book was scarcely completed before James I. died, and thus it appeared in 1625 with a dedication to his successor. Once more complaints were raised in the House of Commons, and for a time Montague was committed to custody. Shortly after his release, however, he was appointed Bishop of Chichester (August 1628), and now, though the Puritan Abbot was still Archbishop of Canterbury, yet with Laud already Bishop of London, and daily rising in the royal favour, it was manifest to all that the supremacy of the Calvinistic party was seriously endangered. While the storm raised by the publication of the *Appello Cæsarem* was still raging, Cosin, the Dean (and afterwards Bishop) of Durham, had in 1627 published his *Devotions*. This was a manual of prayer, containing offices for the Hours, which had been prepared, probably at the request of the King himself, for the use of members of the English Church. It was at once made the subject of a violent attack by William Prynne, who boldly demanded that, for the future, no man should be allowed to speak or write against the Calvinistic doctrines, and that the conclusions of the (Calvinistic) Synod of Dort should be offered as a test to every clergyman in England. Those who refused to subscribe were to be at once excluded from holding any ecclesiastical office. This was a definite challenge to the Church party, and was immediately accepted by them as such. Two years before, in 1626, a royal proclamation for the peace of the Church had been drawn up, in the hope of putting an end to the unseemly controversies which were raging. In some of the towns where this was distributed, it seems to have had some effect.[2] Accordingly Laud now advised Charles to follow it up by a second proclamation, which should

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. v. p. 354.

[2] Cf. Hardwick, p. 200.

be prefixed to a reprint of the Thirty-Nine Articles. This was at once done,[1] and the document thus issued, which is probably from the pen of Laud himself, has kept its place prefixed to the Article to the present day. Its object was to allay the violent disputes by which the Church was torn asunder. And in order to effect this, his majesty was made to express his will, that "in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ . . . . all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scripture, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

Simultaneously with the publication of this declaration a proclamation was issued, calling in Montague's *Appello Cæsarem*, in order that men might "no more trouble themselves with these unnecessary questions, the first occasion being taken away." But, in spite of this proof of earnestness and good faith, the indignation of the Puritan and Calvinistic party among the clergy and in the House of Commons knew no bounds. Some of the clergy at once addressed a petition to the King, complaining that he had placed them in a grave dilemma, for they must either disobey him by attacking the *Pelagian and Arminian heresies*, or else, on the other hand, "provoke the heavier indignation of the King of kings Himself by failing to make known the whole counsel

[1] See the history in Gardiner, vol. vii. p. 21 *seq.*

of God," while the House of Commons, turned for the time into a theological debating society, solemnly adopted the following resolution :—

"We, the Commons now in Parliament assembled, do claim, profess, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of religion which were established in Parliament in the reign of our late Queen Elizabeth, which by public acts of the Church of England, and by the general and concurrent exposition of the writers of our Church, have been delivered to us; and we do reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians." [1]

Into the later history of the controversy there is no necessity to enter here. It is sufficient to point out how true is the remark of Archdeacon Hardwick that such protestations are utterly inconsistent with the pretext that the Articles were framed on a Calvinistic hypothesis, "for as the 'Declaration' aimed at nothing more than to confine the teaching of the clergy to those points which were suggested by a plain and literal exposition of the public formulary, the wild outcry raised against such principles of exegesis seemed to justify the argument which Montague and others were adopting, when they urged that 'Calvinism' is not accordant with the letter of the Articles, and cannot be deduced from them by any of the rules which judges commonly apply to the interpretation of a legal document." [2]

5. Puritan Attempts to Amend or Supplement the Articles.

The observation just quoted is very just, and, in order to confirm it, it will be well to pass briefly in review the attempts to supplement or amend the Articles which at various times proceeded from the Calvinistic party, who

[1] Gardiner, vol. vii. p. 41. [2] Hardwick, p. 203.

thus by their own acts have again and again testified to their conviction that the natural interpretation of the authoritative formularies of the Church of England is not favourable to their tenets. Pitt's saying that the Church of England has a popish liturgy and a Calvinistic set of Articles is well known, and probably represents an opinion which is widely held. It is, however, seriously inaccurate. It must be admitted that there is a difference between the Articles and the Prayer-Book. The Articles, dating as they do from the early years of Elizabeth's reign, are, as has been already implied, the product of a time when churchmen were still standing on the defensive, and had not yet fully worked out their true position. For example, exposed as they were to the violent attacks of the party of the exiles on the whole system of Church government, they were concerned mainly to defend Episcopacy as an allowable form of Church government rather than as a system of divine origin. In other matters, too, their position was more or less tentative, and often negative rather than positive. The Articles naturally reflect the character of the time to which they belong, and speak at times in hesitating and indecisive tones. The Prayer-Book has twice undergone revision since the Articles assumed their present form. The revision of 1604 gave us the latter part of the Catechism with its clear teaching on the sacraments, and the presence in the Eucharist; while the impress of the Caroline divines was stamped upon the book in 1662; and the numerous changes then introduced bear witness to the determination of those who were responsible for them to make the book more adequate to express the mind of the Church catholic. In order, therefore, to arrive at the full teaching and mature judgment of the Church of England, the Articles must be supplemented by the Prayer-Book. Thus much

is frankly admitted. What is *not* admitted is that the Articles were framed on a definite Calvinistic hypothesis, and that the interpretation fastened upon them by Calvinists is true. On such an hypothesis they are, to say the least, seriously defective; and so much was admitted by the party, even as early as 1571. We have already seen that the Parliament of that year hesitated to enforce subscription to those Articles which concern the discipline and polity of the Church. In spite of this it would appear that some of the Puritans were unable to subscribe, and consequently suffered deprivation, under the terms of the Act;[1] and that the doctrinal articles were not altogether satisfactory to them is proved by the *Admonitions to Parliament* which emanated from the Puritan party shortly afterwards. In the first of these (1572) the Puritans ingenuously admit that some reservation was requisite on their part, if they were to accept the Articles, for they write as follows:—"For the articles concerning the substance of doctrine, using a godly interpretation in a point or two, which are either too sparely or else too darkly set down, we were and are ready, according to duty, to subscribe unto them." In the "Second Admonition" some months later they say boldly, "The Book of the Articles of Christian Religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace, which is to be reformed, because it too much inclineth to error."

Again, the whole controversy, which resulted in the preparation of the Lambeth Articles in 1595, is a witness to the same fact. This is not the place to enter into the history of that controversy.[2] The Articles themselves

[1] See the complaint raised in the "first admonition," quoted in Prothero's *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 198.

[2] On the controversy, see Perry's *English Church History*, vol. ii. p. 351 *seq.* and Hardwick p. 159 *seq.*

will be given in the commentary on Article XVII. It will be sufficient to point out here that in order to crush at the outset the revolt against the dominant Calvinism at Cambridge Archbishop Whitgift was persuaded to send down to the university a series of nine articles prepared by Whitaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity, and revised and approved by the archbishop himself and a few other divines assembled at Lambeth. These Articles set forth, in the harshest and narrowest fashion, the main points of the Calvinistic system, and we have only to place them side by side with our own Seventeenth Article to feel convinced that, whatever it means, it does not mean to teach the doctrine of Calvin. Happily the Queen intervened, and the attempt to force the Lambeth Articles upon the Church was dropped. They were not even presented to Convocation, nor have they ever received any authority of any kind in this country.

Once more, at the beginning of the reign of James I., the Puritans confessed that from their point of view the Articles were defective and inadequate. At the Hampton Court Conference, in 1604, various objections were raised to them by Reynolds, the Puritan spokesman, who "moved his majesty that the Book of Articles of Religion, concluded 1562, might be explained in places obscure, and enlarged where some things were defective. For example, whereas Article 16, the words are these: "After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace"; notwithstanding the meaning be sound, yet he desired that, because they may seem to be contrary to the doctrine of God's predestination and election in the Seventeenth Article, both those words might be explained with this, or the like addition, "yet neither totally nor finally"; and also that the nine assertions orthodoxal, as he termed them, concluded upon at

Lambeth, might be inserted into that Book of Articles.[1] Towards the close of the same year an "apology for those ministers who are troubled for refusing of subscription and conformity" was drawn up by the Lincolnshire Nonconformists and presented to the King (December 1, 1604), in which complaint is made that they are unable to subscribe, because they are "persuaded that both the Book of Common Prayer and the other book (*i.e.* the Articles) contain in them sundry things which are not *agreeable* but *contrary to the word of God.*"[2] Again, when, during the Civil War, the Puritan party had obtained the upper hand, one of the first things undertaken by them was a revision of the Articles, "in order to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism." Acting under directions received from the Parliament the Westminster Assembly of Divines, in 1643, appointed a committee, "to consider what amendments were proper to be made in the doctrinal articles of the Church of England, and report them to the assembly, who were ten weeks in debating upon the first fifteen." At a later date the divines were "very busy upon Article XVI. and upon that clause of it which mentioneth departing from grace," when their work was altogether suspended, by order of the Parliament. The first fifteen articles, as amended by this body, have been printed by Neal the Puritan historian,[3] and a singular composition it is. The first article is the only one that was allowed to remain untouched. The changes in Articles IV., V., XIV., and XV. are of little or no consequence. Very significant, however, is the change in Article II., where

[1] "The Sum and Substance of the Conference, etc." in Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 178.

[2] Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 56.

[3] *Op. cit.* vol. iii. Appendix i.

in the clause on the atonement, which states that Christ died "to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men," the word "all" is deliberately expunged, in order to bring the article into harmony with the tenet of "particular redemption." The eighth ("On the creeds") was at first omitted altogether, but the divines were content to let it remain, on condition that the creeds were re-translated and annotated. In the remaining articles changes of more or less importance will be found, which are duly noted in the commentary,[1] and which give in some cases an entirely different complexion to the teaching of the Articles. But even so we learn from the report of divines to the House of Commons that they were not completely satisfied with the result of their labours, for they felt themselves constrained to acknowledge that, in spite of their efforts, very many things continued to be "defective," and "other expressions also were fit to be changed."[2]

Still later, we find that the Puritan objections to the Articles were repeated after the Restoration, and so late as 1689 Richard Baxter, in his *English Nonconformity*, admits that "the words of the Articles in their obvious sense are many times liable to exception, and that there are many things in them that good men may scruple."[3]

The facts here collected together are suggestive. Of themselves they are sufficient to show how utterly false is the popular misconception to which Pitt gave expression in the remark quoted above; and when contrasted with the readiness of Laud and his party to appeal to the "literal and grammatical sense of the Articles," they indicate not obscurely that the interpretation placed upon the Articles by the Laudian school of divines and their successors is historically correct.

[1] See especially the notes on Article IX.

[2] See Hardwick, p. 212.

[3] Ch. xxiv.

6. History of Subscription to the Articles.

When the Forty-Two Articles of 1553 were first issued, the intention of the authorities was that they should be offered for signature to all the clergy of the Church of England, and a royal mandate to this effect was accordingly issued in June 1553. The death of the King in the following month prevented it from being enforced, and when the Articles were revived and revised in 1563, no attempt to require general subscription was made by the Church. The Act of 1571, as has been already shown, was so drawn as to require the acceptance of the doctrinal Articles alone, as distinct from those which concern discipline. But the Convocation that met at the same time proceeded boldly to insist in its canons that every minister before entering on his duties should subscribe to *all* the Articles agreed upon in the Synod,[1] and that all public preachers should signify their assent in the same way,[2] and although these canons were not subscribed by the Lower House, and were left without any formal ratification by the Sovereign, the Court of High Commission proceeded to enforce subscription to *all* the Articles without distinction. This rigour was considerably relaxed during the later years of Grindal's

[1] "Quivis minister ecclesiæ, antequam in sacram functionem ingrediatur, subscribet *omnibus* articulis de religione Christiana, in quos consensum est in Synodo ; et publice ad populum, ubicunque episcopus jusserit, patefaciet conscientiam suam, quid de illis articulis, et universa doctrina sentiat." —Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. i. p. 120.

[2] Quoniam articuli illi religionis Christianæ, in quos consensum est ab episcopis in legitima et sancta Synodo, jussu atque auctoritate serenissimæ principis Elizabethæ convocata et celebrata, haud dubie collecti sunt ex sacris libris Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et cum cælesti doctrina, quæ in illis continetur, per omnia congruunt ; quoniam etiam liber publicarum precum, et liber de inauguratione archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, presbyterorum et diaconorum nihil continent ab illa ipsa doctrina alienum ; quicunque mittentur ad docendum populum, illorum articulorum auctoritatem et fidem, non tantum concionibus suis, sed etiam subscriptione confirmabunt." —*Synodalia*, vol. i. p. 127.

primacy, in consequence of which, upon Whitgift's elevation to the see of Canterbury, one of his earliest acts was to put forth his famous "Three Articles" in 1583. Neither the Parliament nor the Convocation had ordered any precise form of subscription, an omission which Whitgift now proceeded to supply, requiring, "That none be permitted to preach, read, catechise, minister the sacraments, or execute any ecclesiastical function, by what authority soever he be admitted thereunto, unless he first consent and subscribe to these Articles following, before the ordinary of the diocese, viz.:—

"1. That Her Majesty under God hath, and ought to have, the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within her realms, and dominions, and countries, of what estate, ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be; and that none other foreign power, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or temporal, within Her Majesty's said realms, dominions, and countries.

"2. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth nothing in it contrary to the word of God, and that the same may lawfully be used, and that he himself will use the form of the said book prescribed in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, and none other.

"3. That he alloweth the Book of the Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord 1562, and set forth by Her Majesty's authority, and that he believeth all the articles therein contained to be agreeable to the Word of God."[1]

In conformity with this document, subscription was once

[1] Strype's *Whitgift*, bk. iii. ch. iii; cf. Perry, *History of the English Church*, vol. ii. p. 318 *seq.*

more rigorously enforced, and at the beginning of the following century the "Three Articles" received synodal authority, being adopted almost verbatim as the Thirty-sixth Canon in the series put forth and ratified by the Sovereign in 1604.

"Canon XXXVI.

"*Subscription to be required of such as are to be made ministers.*"

No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor either by institution or collation admitted to any ecclesiastical living, nor suffered to preach, to catechise, or to be a lecturer or reader of divinity, in either university, or in any cathedral or collegiate church, city, or market town, parish church, chapel, or in any other place in this realm, except he be licensed either by the archbishop, or by the bishop of the diocese where he is to be placed, under their hands and seals, or by one of the two universities under their seal likewise; and except he shall first subscribe to these three articles following, in such manner and sort as we have here appointed:—

"I. That the King's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within His Majesty's said realms, dominions, and countries.

"II. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said Book prescribed, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and none other.

"III. That he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and by the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God 1562; and that he acknowledgeth all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God.

"To these three Articles, whosoever will subscribe he shall, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz.:—

"*I*, N. N., *do willingly and* ex animo *subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.*

And if any bishop shall ordain, admit, or license any, as is aforesaid, except he first have subscribed in manner and form as here we have appointed, he shall be suspended from giving of orders and licences to preach for the space of twelve months. But if either of the universities shall offend therein, we leave them to the danger of the law, and His Majesty's censure."[1]

The Act of Uniformity of 1662 required a still more stringent declaration of assent to the Book of Common Prayer, to be read publicly in church, by every person instituted or collated to a benefice with cure,[2] but the

[1] Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. i. p. 267. The canons were passed by both Houses, and ratified by letters patent, in *Latin*, but an English translation was at once made, and printed by "Robert Barker, printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, anno 1604."

[2] "I, *A. B.*, do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled, 'The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland: together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form or Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons' (13 & 14 Chas. II., ch. 4, § 6)."

subject of subscription to the Articles did not come within its province,[1] and, therefore, the form ordered by the Thirty-sixth Canon remained in force.

After the revolution of 1688 an attempt was made to get rid of the various forms of subscriptions and declarations required from the clergy, and the abortive Comprehension Bill of 1689 proposed that "No other subscriptions or declarations shall from henceforward be required of any person, but only the declaration mentioned in a statute made in the thirtieth year of the reign of the late King Charles the Second, intituled, 'An Act for the more effectual preserving the King's person and government by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament,'" and also this declaration following:—

"I, *A. B.*, do submit to the present constitution of the Church of England. I acknowledge that the doctrine of it contains in it all things necessary to salvation, and that I will conform myself to the worship and the government thereof, as established by law. And I solemnly promise, in the exercise of my ministry, to preach and practice according thereunto." [2]

The Bill was introduced into the House of Lords, without any reference whatever to Convocation, and though it passed the Lords the House of Commons declined altogether to discuss it. "They were much offended with the Bill of Comprehension, as containing matters relating to the Church, in which the representative body of the clergy had not been so much as advised with."[3] Accordingly, the somewhat ambitious scheme "for uniting their

[1] Except so far as *lecturers* were concerned (13 & 14 Chas. II., c. 4, § 19).

[2] See the report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to consider the subscriptions, declarations, and oaths required to be made and taken by the clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, 1865 (p. 53), where the form finally agreed upon by the House of Lords is given.

[3] For the history of the bill see *Perry*, vol. ii. p. 543 *seq.*, and Macaulay *History of England*, ch. xi.

Majesties' Protestant subjects" was hastily dropped, and the agitation in favour of a change in the forms of subscription died away. In practice, the subscriptions required by the terms of the 13th Act of Elizabeth and the Thirty-sixth Canon were combined, the form generally used being as follows:—

"I, *A. B.*, do willingly and from my heart subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to the three Articles in the Thirty-sixth Canon, and to all things therein contained."

In spite of the stringency of the tests required it was found early in the last century that a considerable number of clergy of Arian and Socinian opinions had crept into the ministry of the Church. These men, when confronted with the terms of the declaration to which they had set their hands, boldly declared that it was "an avowed principle among them that these Articles (viz. the Thirty-Nine) may lawfully and conscientiously be subscribed in any sense in which they themselves, by their own interpretation, can reconcile them to Scripture, without regard to the meaning and intention, either of the persons who first compiled them, or who now impose them."[1] They were thus ready to evade their plain meaning and make short work of their "literal and grammatical sense." This dishonest and disingenuous manner of subscribing was denounced with great energy by Daniel Waterland in his "Case of Arian Subscription Considered,"[2] and other works, and its advocates soon found that their position was an

[1] See Waterland's "Case of Arian Subscription Considered," *Works*, vol. ii. p. 264. Dr. S. Clarke in his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, published in 1712, had laid it down as a maxim that "every person may reasonably agree to such forms, whenever he can, *in any sense at all*, reconcile them with Scripture."

[2] Published in 1726.

utterly untenable one. Then began an agitation for the removal of all tests, headed by Archdeacon Blackburne, the author of the notorious *Confessional*, a work in which "he denies that churches have any right to make confessions of faith, and asserts that the inalienable privilege of every one to believe as he pleases ought not to be interfered with. That these objectionable confessions, every one of which, according to Blackburne, contains "very material decisions from which an intelligent Christian may reasonably dissent," should be imposed as terms of qualification for office, and formal subscription required to them, is contended to be an abominable injustice and tyranny."[1] A petition was, accordingly, prepared, setting forth the views of the Latitudinarian party, and introduced into the House of Commons on February 6th, 1772. Its rejection was moved by the member for Oxford, Sir Roger Newdigate. Edmund Burke spoke strongly against it, and in the end the proposal to receive and consider the petition was rejected by 217 to 71. After this decisive defeat a considerable time elapsed before any further attempt was made to alter the terms of the declaration required from the clergy, and the forms of assent given above remained unchanged until the year 1865. A few years previously an abortive bill had been introduced into the House of Lords, for the purpose of abolishing the oaths and declarations required. Shortly after this a royal commission was appointed to consider the whole subject. Their report showed that the forms in use were unnecessarily numerous and complicated, and the commissioners were unanimous in recommending the substitution of a single declaration of assent to the Prayer-Book and Articles together, in place of the cumbrous forms till then in use. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1865 to give legal

[1] Perry's *English Church History*, vol. iii. p. 101.

effect to their recommendations, and, at the same time, Convocation obtained leave from the Crown to revise the Canons so far as was necessary. An amended version of Canon XXXVI. was made and published by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and confirmed by royal letters patent,[1] and since that time the declaration of assent made by all candidates for orders, as well as by all persons admitted to any benefice or licensed to preach has run as follows :—

"I, *A. B.*, do solemnly make the following declaration. I assent to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the [United] Church of England [and Ireland], as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the word of God: and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."[2]

Thus it is from the clergy and the clergy only that the Church demands subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. It is, of course, well known that at one time laymen were also required to subscribe them in the universities,—at the time of matriculation at Oxford, and before proceeding to a degree at both Oxford and Cambridge. This was first required at Oxford by the Puritan Chancellor Leicester, in the sixteenth century, in order to exclude Romanists from the university. Cambridge followed during the reign of James I. But the legislation of 1854 and 1871 has entirely removed any such

[1] The history of the agitation that led to the appointment of the commission is told in the *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. i. p. 487 *seq.* See also the report of the Commissioners themselves.

[2] The words in brackets were of course disused after the Irish Church was disestablished in 1869.

requirement. Nor can the Church fairly be held responsible for it while it lasted. It was really due to the authorities of the universities as such, and to the Crown.[1] The Thirty-sixth Canon of 1604, it is true, stated that no person should be suffered to preach, to catechise, or to be a lecturer or reader of divinity in either university without subscribing the "Three Articles." But as if those who were responsible for it were conscious that in making this demand they were exceeding the rightful limits of their jurisdiction, they added that "if either of the universities shall offend therein, we leave them to the danger of the law and His Majesty's censure."

But though the Church of England has never asked for any formal act of subscription to the Articles from the lay members of her communion, it cannot be denied that the Fifth Canon of 1604 makes some approach towards regarding them as terms of communion.

[1] The following are the material facts in the history of subscription to the Articles at the universities. It was first required from candidates for degrees at Oxford by authority of the university in Convocation assembled, in October 1576. A few years later (Nov. 1581) in consequence of a suggestion from the Chancellor, Leicester, it was also required by the university from all persons at *matriculation*. In 1587, during the Chancellorship of Hatton, a declaration of assent to the Prayer-Book, as well as subscription to the Articles, was demanded from candidates for degrees; and in the reign of James I., in consequence of an edict of the King (dated Jan. 18, 1616), a decree of the university (March 31, 1617) required from all candidates for degrees (except in music) subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, the "Three Articles" of the Thirty-sixth Canon, and the Oath of Supremacy.

At Cambridge subscription to the "Three Articles" was for the first time required from candidates for all degrees by edict of James I., dated December 4, 1616, confirmed by decree of the heads of houses in 1623.

In 1772 for the degree of B.A., and in 1779 for B.C.L., M.B., and M.D., there was substituted by a grace of the senate a simple declaration of membership of the Church of England: "I, *A. B.*, do declare that I am, *bonâ fide*, a member of the Church of England, as by law established." But at Oxford the old forms of subscription were still required, though we learn from the report of the Oxford University Commission of 1852 that different interpretations were usually given, though without authority, by

"*Impugners of the Articles of Religion, established in the Church of England, censured.*

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, That any of the Nine-and-Thirty Articles agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred sixty-two, for avoiding diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of such his wicked errors."

The Canon, however, strong as its language is, was apparently intended to prohibit the laity from impugning and attacking the Articles rather than to require a

different vice-chancellors or pro-vice-chancellors at the time of subscription for matriculation. "Sometimes the person matriculated is told that 'he hereby expresses his assent to the Thirty-Nine Articles, so far as he knows them'; sometimes that 'he probably has not read them, but that he has no objection to them'; sometimes that 'he thereby declares himself to be a member of the Church of England.' Sometimes, however, no observation is made."—*Report*, p. 55. Further, there was much justice in the following remark of the commissioners: "It certainly is singular that a lay corporation should require from laymen, simply as a condition of membership, that which the Church of England does not require for participation in its most sacred ordinance."—*Report*, p. 55. Accordingly, the Oxford University Act of 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. lxxxi.) made unnecessary any declaration or oath in regard to religion at matriculation. It also enjoined that it should be unnecessary for any person taking the degrees of B.A., B.C.L., B.M., or B.Mus., to make or subscribe any declaration or take any oath. But such degree was not to constitute a qualification for holding any office formerly held by members of the Church of England, unless the person had taken the oaths and declarations required. Finally, the Universities Test Act of 1871 (34 Vict. c. xxvi.) laid down definitely that no person on taking any degree other than a degree in divinity, or holding lay, academical, or collegiate offices should be required to subscribe any formulary of faith.

definite and formal assent to them. Certainly it was so regarded by Archbishop Laud, who in his conference with Fisher the Jesuit, writes of it as follows:—

"A. C. will prove 'the Church of England a shrew, and such a shrew. For in her Book of Canons, she excommunicates every man, who shall hold anything contrary to any part of the said Articles.' So A. C. But surely these are not the very words of the Canon, nor perhaps the sense. Not the words, for they are: 'Whosoever shall affirm that the Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, etc.'; and perhaps not the sense. For it is one thing for a man to hold an opinion privately within himself, and another thing boldly and publicly to affirm it. And, again, it is one thing to hold contrary to some part of an Article, which perhaps may be but in the manner of expression; and another thing positively to affirm, that the Articles in any part of them are superstitious and erroneous. But this is not the main of the business; for though the Church of England denounce excommunication, as is before expressed, yet she comes far short of the Church of Rome's severity, whose anathemas are not only for Thirty-Nine Articles, but for very many more, above one hundred in matter of doctrine, and that in many points as far remote from the foundation; though, to the far greater rack of men's consciences, they must be all made fundamental, if that Church have once determined them; whereas the Church of England never declared that every one of her Articles are fundamental in the faith. For it is one thing to say, no one of them is superstitious or erroneous; and quite another to say, every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men's belief. Besides, the Church of England prescribes only to her own children, and by those Articles provides but for her own peaceable consent in those doctrines of truth. But the Church of

Rome severely imposes her doctrine upon the whole world, under pain of damnation."[1]

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the only formulary to which a layman is *directly* required to assent is the Apostles' Creed. It is this which is set before him at his baptism, and again in the visitation of the sick, as containing the Articles of the faith. The position which the Nicene Creed occupies in the Church's eucharistic office, where it is appointed to be sung or said before the worshippers are invited to join in the greatest act of fellowship and communion possible, practically *interprets* for us the sense in which the briefer form is to be understood. But it remains true of the Apostles' Creed that for the layman, "that, and that alone, is required at his baptismal admission within the Church; that, and that alone, is asked for at the deathbed, as a sufficient proof that the man retains what he orginally began with—the Christian's confession of a true faith."[2]

The Articles, on the other hand, are at least primarily for *the clergy*. The loyal and faithful laity of the Church will naturally regard them with respect, and will in accordance with the terms of the Fifth Canon abstain from impugning them. But the Church never requires from them a formal act of assent to them. "Their proper usage is as a τύπος διδαχῆς, a sketch or framework of sound doctrine, by which the Church takes engagements from her clergy and other teaching officers, that—while occupying her pulpits and teaching in her name—they will not be disloyal; but will teach in her spirit, and present her time-honoured doctrine, albeit in sundry forms and divers manners to her people."[3]

[1] *Works* (Anglo-Catholic Library), vol. ii. p. 60.

[2] Curteis, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 309 (Ed. 1).

[3] *Ibid.* The whole passage is worth consulting, but it is not entirely free from exaggeration, as there is no reference in it either to the

7. The Chief Divisions of the Articles.

It only remains to mark out the chief groups or divisions into which the Articles fall, before proceeding to the commentary upon them. The most natural and convenient division of them, in accordance with their subject-matter, appears to be the following:—

I. The Catholic Faith and where it may be found (Articles I.–VIII.).

(*a*) The Faith (Articles I.–V.).

(*b*) Scripture and the Creeds (Articles VI.–VIII.).

II. Personal Religion, or Man and his Salvation (Articles IX.–XVIII.).

III. Corporate Religion, or the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments (Articles XIX.–XXXI.).

IV. Miscellaneous Articles, relating to the discipline of the Church of England, its relation to the civil power, etc. (Article XXXII.–XXXIX.).

Fifth Canon, or to the position of the Nicene Creed in the Communion Service.

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF 1553.

1553.

Articuli de quibus in Synodo Londinensi, *Anno Dom. MDLII.* ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem et consensum veræ religionis firmandum, inter Episcopos et alios Eruditos Viros convenerat.

1553.

Articles agreed on by the Bishoppes, and other learned menne in the Synode at London, in the yere of our Lorde Godde, MDLII., for the auoiding of controuersie in opinions, and the establishement of a godlie concorde, in certeine matiers of religion.

I.

De fide in Sacrosanctam Trinitatem.

Unus est vivus et verus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensæ potentiæ, sapientiæ, ac bonitatis, creator et conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinæ naturæ tres sunt personæ, ejusdem essentiæ, potentiæ, ac æternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

I.

Of faith in the holie Trinitie.

There is but one liuing and true God, and he is euerlasting, with out bodie, partes, or passions, of infinite power, wisedome, and goodnesse, the maker, and preseruer of all thinges bothe visible and inuisible, and in vnitie of this Godhead there bee three persones of one substaunce, power, and eternitie, the Father, the Soone, and the holie Ghoste.

II.

Verbum Dei verum hominem esse factum.

Filius qui est verbum patris in utero beatæ Virginis, ex illius substantiâ naturam humanam assumpsit, ita ut duæ naturæ, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personæ, fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctæ, ex quibus est unus *Christus*, verus Deus et verus homo, qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mor-

II.

That the worde, or Sonne of God, was made a very man.

The sonne whiche is the woorde of the father tooke mannes nature in the wombe of the blessed virgine Marie, of her Substaunce, so that two hole and perfeicte natures, that is to saie, the Godhead, and manhode were ioigned together into one persone, neuer to be diuided, whereof is one Christe very God, and very

tuus et sepultus, ut patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

manne, who truely suffred, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his father to vs, and to be a sacrifice for all sinne of manne, bothe originall, and actuall.

III.

De descensu Christi ad Inferos.

Quemadmodum *Christus* pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse. Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, Spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.

III.

Of the goyng doune of Christe into Helle.

As Christ died and was buried for vs : so also it is to be beleued, that he went doune into hell. For the bodie laie in the Sepulchre, until the resurrection : but his Ghoste departing from him, was with the Ghostes that were in prison, or in helle, and didde preache to the same, as the place of S. Peter doeth testifie.

IV.

Resurrectio Christi.

Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanæ naturæ pertinentibus, recepit, cum quibus in cœlum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines revertatur.

IV.

The Resurrection of Christ.

Christe didde truelie rise againe from deathe and tooke again his bodie with flesh, bones, and all things apperteining to the perfection of mannes nature, wherewith he ascended into Heauen, and there sitteth, untill he retourne to iudge men at the last daie.

V.

Divinæ Scripturæ doctrina sufficit ad salutem.

Scriptura sacra continet omnia quæ sunt ad salutem necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur neque inde probari potest, licet interdum a fidelibus, ut pium et conducibile ad ordinem et decorum admittatur, attamen a quoquam non exigendum

V.

The doctrine of holie Scripture is sufficient to Saluation.

Holie Scripture conteineth all thinges necessarie to Saluation : So that whatsoeuer is neither read therein, nor maie be proved thereby, although it be somtime receuied of the faithful, as Godlie, and profitable for an ordre, and comeli-

est ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur, et ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur.

nesse: Yeat no manne ought to bee constreigned to beleue it, as an article of faith, or repute it requisite to the necessitie of Saluation.

VI.

Vetus Testamentum non est rejiciendum.

Testamentum Vetus, quasi Novo contrarium sit, non est repudiandum, sed retinendum, quandoquidem tam in veteri quàm in novo per Christum qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo, æterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare non sunt audiendi, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt.

VI.

The olde Testament is not to be refused.

The olde Testamente is not to bee put awaie as though it were contrarie to the newe, but to be kept still: for bothe in the olde, and newe Testamentes, everlasting life is offered to mankinde by Christ, who is the onelie mediatour betwene Godde and manne, being bothe Godde and manne. Wherefore thei are not to be hearde, whiche feigne that the olde Fathers didde looke onely for transitorie promises.

VII.

Symbola tria.

Symbola tria, Niceni, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolicum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt. Nam firmissimis divinarum scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

VII.

The three Credes.

The three credes, Nicene Crede, Athanasius Crede, and that whiche is commonlie called the Apostles Crede, ought thoroughly to be received: for thei maie be proued by most certeine warrauntes of holie Scripture.

VIII.

Peccatum Originale.

Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani, et hodie Anabaptistæ repetunt) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium et depravatio naturæ cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati: qua fit ut ab originali justitia quam

VIII.

Of originall or birthe sinne.

Originall sinne standeth not in the folowing of Adam, as the Pellagianes doe vainlie talke, whiche also the Anabaptistes doe now a daies renue, but it is the fault, and corruption of the nature of every manne, that naturallie is

longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat: unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio, qua fit ut affectus carnis, græce φρόνημα σαρκός, quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium vocant, legi Dei non subjiciatur. Et quamquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter *Christum* est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.

engendred of the ofspring of Adam, whereby manne is very farre gone from his former righteousnesse, whiche he had at his creation and is of his owne nature geuen to euill, so that the fleshe desireth alwaies contrarie to the spirit, and therefore in euery persone borne into this worlde, it deserueth Goddes wrath and damnation: And this infection of nature doeth remaine, yea in theim that are baptized, wherby the lust of the fleshe called in Greke φρόνημα σαρκός, (whiche some do expoune, the wisedome, some sensualitie, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh) is not subject to the lawe of God. And although there is no condemnation for theim that beleue, and are baptized, yet the Apostle doeth confesse, that concupiscence, and lust hath of itself the nature of sinne.

IX.

De libero arbitrio.

Absque gratia Dei, quæ per Christum est, nos preveniente ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quæ Deo grata sint et accepta, nihil valemus.

IX.

Of free wille.

We have no power to dooe good workes pleasaunte, and acceptable to God, with out the grace of God by Christ, preuenting us that wee maie haue a good wille, and working in us, when we have that wille.

X.

De gratia.

Gratia Christi, seu spiritus sanctus qui per eundem datur, cor lapideum aufert, et dat cor carneum. Atque licet ex nolentibus quæ recta sunt volentes faciat, et ex volentibus prava, nolentes reddat, voluntati

X.

Of grace.

The Grace of Christ, or the holie Ghost by him geuen dothe take awaie the stonie harte, and geueth an harte of flesh. And although those that have no will to good thinges, he maketh them to will,

nihilominus violentiam nullam infert. Et nemo hac de causa, cum peccaverit, seipsum excusare potest, quasi nolens aut coactus peccaverit, ut eam ob causam accusari non mereatur aut damnari.

and those that would euil thinges, he maketh them not to wille the same: Yet neuerthelesse he enforceth not the will. And therfore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself, as not worthie to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillinglie, or by compulsion.

XI.

De Hominis justificatione.

Justificatio ex solo fide *Jesu Christi*, eo sensu quo in Homelia de justificatione explicatur, est certissima et saluberrima Christianorum doctrina.

XI.

Of the Justification of manne.

Justification by onely faith in Jesus Christ in that sence, as it is declared in the homelie of Justification, is a moste certeine, and holesome doctrine for Christian menne.

XII.

Opera ante justificationem.

Opera quæ fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt. Neque gratiam (ut multi vocant) de congruo merentur: Imo cum non sint facta ut Deus illa fieri voluit et præcepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

XII.

Workes before Justification.

Workes done before the Grace of Christe and the inspiratione of his spirite are not pleasant to God, forasmoche as thei spring not of faithe in Jesu Christe, neither do thei make menne mete to receive Grace, or (as the schole aucthoures saie) deserue grace of congruitie: but because thei are not done as god hath willed and commaunded theim to bee done, we doubt not, but thei have the nature of sinne.

XIII.

Opera Supererogationis.

Opera quæ Supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate prædicari, nam illis declarant homines non

XIII.

Woorkes of Supererogation.

Voluntarie woorkes besides, ouer, and above Goddes commaundementes, whiche thei cal woorkes of Supererogation, cannot be taught

tantum se Deo reddere quæ tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere quam deberent: cum aperte Christus dicat, *Cum feceritis omnia quæcunque præcepta sunt vobis, dicite: Servi inutiles sumus.*

without arrogancie, and iniquitie. For by theim menne dooe declare, that thei dooe not onely rendre to God, as moche as thei are bounde to dooe, but that thei dooe more for his sake, then of bounden duetie is required: Whereas Christe saieth plainlie: when you haue dooen al that are commaunded you, saie, We be unprofitable seruauntes.

XIV.

Nemo præter Christum est sine peccato.

Christus in nostræ naturæ veritate, per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit ut agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Joannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes, et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

XIV.

No man is without sinne, but Christe alone.

Christe in the trueth of our nature was made like unto us in al thinges, sinne onely except, from whiche He was clearelie uoide both in His fleshe, and in His spirite. He came to be the lambe without spotte, who by sacrifice of himself made ones for euer, should take away the sinnes of the worlde: and sinne (as Saint Jhon saieth) was not in him. But the rest, yea, althoughe we be baptized, and borne againe in Christe, yeat we all offende in many thinges: and if we saie, we have no sinne, wee deceive our selues, and the trueth is not in us.

XV.

De peccato in spiritum sanctum.

Non omne peccatum mortale post baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in spiritum sanctum et irremissibile: proinde lapsis à baptismo in peccata, locus penitentiæ non est negandus. Post acceptum spiritum sanctum possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per gratiam Dei

XV.

Of sinne against the holie Ghoste.

Euery deadlie sinne willinglie committed after Baptisme, is not sinne against the holie Ghoste, and unpardonable: wherefore the place for penitentes, is not to bee denied to soche as fall into sinne after Baptisme. After we have receiued the holie Ghoste, we maie departe from grace geuen, and fall

resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi damnandi sunt, qui se quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipiscentibus pœnitentiæ locum denegant.

into sinne, and by the grace of God wee maie rise again, and amende our liues. And therefore thei are to be condemned, whiche saie, thei can no more sinne as long as thei live here, or denie the place for penitentes to soche as trulie repent, and amende their lives.

XVI.

Blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum.

Blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum, est cum quis Verborum Dei manifestè perceptam veritatem, ex malitia et obfirmatione animi, convitiis insectatur, et hostiliter insequitur. Atque hujusmodi, quia maledicto sunt ob noxii, gravissimo sese astringunt sceleri. Unde peccati hoc genus irremissibile a Domino appellatur, et affirmatur.

XVI.

Blasphemie against the holie Ghoste.

Blasphemie against the holie Ghost is, when a man of malicc and stubburnesse of minde, doeth raile upon the trueth of goddes word manifestlie perceiued, and being enemie thereunto persecuteth the same. And because soche be guilty of Goddes curse, thei entangle themselues with a moste grieuous, and hainous crime, whereupon this kinde of sinne is called and affirmed of the Lorde, unpardonable.

XVII.

De Prædestinatione et Electione.

Prædestinatio ad vitam est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit eos quos elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque ut vasa in honorem efficta, per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere; unde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi, spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur, vocationi per gratiam parent, justificantur gratis, adoptantur in filios ni-

XVII.

Of predestination and election.

Predestination to life, is the euerlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundacions of the worlde were laied) he hath constantlie decreed by his owne judgemente secrete to vs, to deliuer from curse, and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankinde, and to bring them to euerlasting saluation by Christ, as vesselles made to honour: whereupon, soche as haue so excellent a benefite of God geuen unto theim be called, according to Goddes purpose, by his spirite, woorking in due

geniti Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes, in bonis operibus sancte ambulant, et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem.

Quemadmodum prædestinationis et electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis, et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis, et his qui sentiunt in se vim spiritus Christi, facta carnis, et membra quæ adhuc sunt super terram mortificantem, animumque ad cœlestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum, plurimum stabilit atque confirmat; tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: Ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari prædestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos diabolus pertrudit vel in desperationem, vel in æque perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem.

Deinde licet prædestinationis decreta sunt nobis ignota, promissiones tamen divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt: et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in Verbo Dei habemus diserte revelatam.

seasonc, thei through grace obeie the calling, thei be justified frely, thei be made sounes by adoptione, thei bee made like the image of Goddes onely begotten sonne Jesu Christe, thei walke religiouslie in goode woorkes, and at length by Goddes mercie, thei atteine to everlasting felicitie.

As the Godlie consideration of predestination, and our election in Christe is ful of swete, pleasaunte, and vnspeakable coumfort to godlie persones, and soche as feele in themselves the woorking of the spirite of Christe, mortifying the woorkes of the flesh, and their earthlie membres, and drawing up their minde to high and heauenly thinges, aswel because it doeth greatly stablish and confirme their faith of eternal saluation to bee enioicd through Christe, as because it doeth feruentlie kindle their love towardes Godde: So for curious, and carnall persones lacking the Spirite of Christ, to have continuallie before their yies the sentence of Goddes predestination, is a moste daungerous dounefall, whereby the Deuill maie thrust them either into desperation, or into a rechielesnesse of most uncleane liuing, no lesse perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, although the Decrees of predestination are vnknowen unto us, yeat we must receiue Goddes promises, in sochewise as thei bee generallic set foorth to vs in holie Scripture, and in our doings that wille of Godde is to be folowed, whiche we haue expresselie declared vnto us in the woorde of Godde.

XVIII.

Tantum in nomine Christi speranda est æterna salus.

Sunt et illi anathematizandi qui dicere audent, unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturæ accurate vixerit: cum sacræ literæ tantum Jesu Christi nomen prædicent in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

XVIII.

Wee must truste to obteine eternal Saluation onely by the name of Christe.

Thei also are to be had accursed, and abhorred that presume to saie, that euery man shalbe saued by the Lawe, or secte whiche he professeth, so that he bee diligente to frame his life according to that Lawe, and the lighte of Nature: For holie Scripture doeth sette out vnto vs onely the name of Jesu Christ, whereby menne must be saued.

XIX.

Omnes obligantur ad moralia legis præcepta servanda.

Lex a Deo data per Mosen, licet quoad cæremonias et ritus Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus præcepta in aliqua Repub. necessario recipi debeant, nihilominus ab obedientia mandatorum quæ Moralia vocantur, nullus quantumvis Christianus est solutus. Quare illi non sunt audiendi, qui sacras literas tantum infirmis datas esse perhibent, et spiritum perpetuo jactant, a quo sibi quæ prædicant suggeri asserunt, quanquam cum sacris literis apertissime pugnent.

XIX.

All men are bounde to kepe the moral commandementes of the Lawe.

The Lawe, whiche was geuen of God by Moses, although it binde not Christian menne, as concerning the Ceremonies, and Rites of the same: Neither is it required, that the Civile Preceptes and Ordres of it should of necessitie bee received in any commune weale: Yet no manne (bee he neuer so perfeicte a Christian), is exempte and lose from the Obedience of those Commaundementes, whiche are called Moral. Wherfore thei are not to be harkened vnto, who affirme that holie Scripture is geuen onlie to th weake, and do boaste theimselues continually of the spirit, of whom (thei sai) thei haue learned soche things as thei teache, although the same be most euidently repugnaunt to the holie Scripture.

XX.

De Ecclesia.

Ecclesia Christi visibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum prædicatur, et Sacramenta quoad ea quae necessario exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur.

Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hyerosolymitana, Alexandrina et Antiochena, ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et cæremoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quæ credenda sunt.

XX.

Of the Church.

The visible Churche of Christe is a congregation of faiethfull Menne, in the whiche the pure worde of God is preached, and the Sacramentes be duelie ministred, according to Christes ordinaunce, in all those thinges that of necessitie are requisite to the same. As the Churche of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, and of Antioche hath erred: So also the Churche of Rome hath erred, not onely in their liuing, but also in matiers of their faith.

XXI.

De Ecclesia authoritate.

Ecclesiæ non licet quicquam instituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur: neque unum Scripturæ locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum librorum testis et conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita præter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

XXI.

Of the aucthoritie of the Churche.

It is not lawfulle for the Churche to ordein anything, that is contrarie to Goddes worde writen, neither maie it so expoune one place of Scripture, that it be repugnaunt to an other. Wherefore although the Churche be a witnesse and a keper of holie writte, yet as it ought not to decree any thing againste the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thinge to bee beleued for necessitie of saluation.

XXII.

De authoritate Conciliorum Generalium.

Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate Principum congregari non possunt; et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant qui non omnes spiritu et verbis Dei reguntur, et errare possunt et interdum errarunt, etiam in his quæ ad normam

XXII.

Of the aucthoritie of general Counsailes.

Generall counsailes maie not be gathered together, without the commaundemente, and will of Princes: and when thei be gathered (forasmuche as thei be an assemblie of men whereof all be not gouerned with the spirite, and worde of God)

pietatis pertinent: ideo quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent neque authoritatem, nisi ostendi possunt e sacris literis esse desumpta.

thei mai erre, and sometime have erred, not onely in worldlie matiers, but also in thinges perteining vnto God. Wherefore thinges ordeined by theim, as necessarie to saluation, haue neither strength, nor auctoritie, onleese it maie be declared, that thei be taken out of holie Scripture.

XXIII.

De Purgatorio.

Scholasticorum doctrina de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, nec non de invocatione sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo Verbo Dei perniciose contradicit.

XXIII.

Of Purgatorie.

The doctrine of Scholeaucthoures concerning Purgatorie, Pardones, worshipping, and adoration as well of images, as of reliques, and also inuocation of sainctes, is a fonde thing vainlie feigned, and grounded vpon no warraunt of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the woorde of God.

XXIV.

Nemo in Ecclesia ministret nisi vocatus.

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice prædicandi, aut administrandi sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad hæc obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in Ecclesia, cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.

XXIV.

No manne maie minister in the Congregation, except he be called.

It is not lawful for any man to take vpon him the office of Publique preaching, or ministring the sacramentes in the congregation, before he be lawfullie called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfullie called, and sent, whiche be chosen, and called to this woorke by menne, who haue publique auctoritie geuen vnto them in the congregation, to cal, and sende ministres into the Lordes vineyarde.

XXV.

Agendum est in Ecclesia lingua quæ sit populi nota.

Decentissimum est et Verbo Dei

XXV.

Menne must speake in the Congregation in soche toung, as the people vnderstandeth.

It is moste semelie, and moste

maxime congruit, ut nihil in Ecclesia publice legatur aut recitetur lingua populo ignota, idque Paulus fieri vetuit nisi adesset qui interpretaretur.

agreable to the woorde of God, that in the congregation nothing be openlie readde, or spoken in a tongue vnknown to the people, the whiche thiug S. Paul did forbidde, except some were presentc that should declare the same.

XXVI.

De Sacramentis.

Dominus noster Jesus Christus Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatu facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus et Cœna Domini. Sacramenta non instituta sunt à Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur: et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato; quæ vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium sed admodum superstitiosum: qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

Sacramenta per Verbum Dei instituta, non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

XXVI.

Of the Sacramentes.

Our Lorde Jesus Christe hathe knitte toguether a companie of newe people with Sacramentes, moste fewe in numbre, moste easie to bee kepte, moste excellent in significatione, as is Baptisme, and the Lordes Supper.

The Sacramentes werc not ordeined of Christe to be gased vpon, or to be caried about, but that we should rightlie usc them. And in soche onely, as worthelie receiue the same, thei haue an wholesome effecte, and operacione, and yet not that of the woorke wrought, as some men speake, whiche worde, as it is straunge, and unknowen to holie Scripture: so it engendreth no Godlie, but a verie supersticious sense.

But thei that receive the Sacramentes unworthelie, purchace to theimselves damnatione as Saincte Paule saieth.

Sacramentes ordeined by the worde of God be not onely badges, and tokens of Christien Mennes professione, but rather thei bee certeine sure witnesses, and effectuall signes of grace, and Goddes good will towarde vs, by the whiche he dothe worke invisiblie in vs, and dothe not onlie quicken, but also strengthen, and confirme our faith in him.

XXVII.

Ministrorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum divinarum.

Quamvis in Ecclesia visibili, bonis mali sint semper admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et Sacramentorum administrationi præsint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et authoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in Verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipiendis: neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur quoad eos, qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur. Ad Ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in eos inquiratur, accusenturque ab iis, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio, deponantur.

XXVII.

The wickednesse of the Ministres dooeth not take awaie the effectuall operation of Goddes ordinances.

Although in the visible Churche the euill be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the euil haue chief auctboritie in the ministration of the worde and Sacramentes: Yet forasmoche as thei doe not the same in their owne name, but dooe minister by Christes commission, and auctoritie: we maie use their ministerie bothe in hearing the worde of God, and in the receiuing the sacramentes, neither is the effecte of Goddes ordinaunces taken awaie by their wickednesse, or the grace of Goddes giftes diminished from soche, as by faieth and rightlie receiue the Sacramentes ministred vnto them, whiche bee effectuall, because of Christes institutione and promise, although thei be ministred by euil men. Neverthelesse it apperteineth to the discipline of the Churche, that enquirie be made of soche, and that thei bee accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences, and finally being founde guiltie by iuste iudgement, be deposed.

XXVIII.

De Baptismo.

Baptismus non est tantum signum professionis ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernuntur, sed etiam est signum regenerationis, per quod tanquam

XXVIII.

Of Baptisme.

Baptisme is not onelie a signe of profession, and marke of difference, wherby Christien menne are discerned from other that bee not christened, but it is also a signe,

per instrumentum recte Baptismum suscipientes, Ecclesiæ inferuntur,[1] promissiones de remissione peccatorum atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinæ invocationis gratia augetur. Mos Ecclesiæ baptizandi parvulos et laudandus et omnino in Ecclesia retinendus.

and seale of our newe birth, whereby, as by an instrument thei that receive Baptisme rightlie, are grafted in the Churche, the promises of forgeuenesse of sinne, and our adoption to bee the sonnes of God, are visiblie signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased by vertue of praier vnto God. The custome of the Churche to christen yonge children, is to bee commended, and in any wise to bee reteined in the Churche.

XXIX.

De Cœna Domini.

Cœna Domini non est tantum signum mutuæ benevolentiæ Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostræ per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo rite, digne et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi: Similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis Scripturæ verbis adversatur et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Quum naturæ humanæ veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non posset, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus, in multis et

XXIX.

Of the Lordes Supper.

The Supper of the Lorde is not onely a signe of the love that Christiens ought to have among theimselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christes death, insomoche that to soche as rightlie, woorthelie, and with faieth receive the same, the breade whiche we breake is a communion of the bodie of Christe. Likewise the Cuppe of blessing, is a communion of the bloude of Christe.

Transubstanciation, or the chaunge of the substaunce of breade and wine into the substaunce of Christes bodie, and bloude cannot be proved by holie writte, but is repugnaunt to the plaine woordes of Scripture, and hath given occasione to many supersticions.

Forasmoche as the trueth of mannes nature requireth, that the bodie of one, and theself same manne cannot be at one time in diuerse places, but must nedes be in some one certeine place: There-

[1] V. l. inseruntur.

diversis locis, eodem tempore, præsens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacræ literæ, Christus in Cœlum fuit sublatus et ibi usque ad finem seculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

fore the bodie of Christe cannot bee presente at one time in many, and diuerse places. And because (as holie Scripture doeth teache) Christe was taken vp into heauen, and there shall continue unto thende of the worlde, a faithful man ought not, either to beleue, or openlie to confesse the reall, and bodilie presence (as thei term it) of Christes fleshe and bloude, in the Sacramente of the Lordes Supper.

The Sacramente of the Lordes Supper was not commaunded by Christes ordinaunce to be kepte, caried about, lifted up, nor worshipped.

XXX.

De unica Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus: neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, Sacerdotem offere Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis, figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ imposturæ.

XXX.

Of the perfeicte oblacion of Christe made vpon the crosse.

The offring of Christe made ones for euer, is the perfeicte redemption, the pacifiyng of goddes displeasure, and satisfaction for al the sinnes of the whole world, bothe original and actuall: and there is none other satisfaction for sinne, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the whiche, it was commonlie saied, that the Prieste did offre Christe for the quicke and the dead, to have remission of peine or sinne, were forged fables, and daungerouse deceiptes.

XXXI.

Cælibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis non est mandatum ut cæli-

XXXI.

The state of single life is commaunded to no man by the worde of God.

Bishoppes, Priestes, and Deacons

batum voveant: neque jure divino coguntur matrimonio abstinere.

are not commaunded to vowe the state of single life without marriage, neither by Goddes lawe are thei compelled to absteine from matrimonie.

XXXII.

Excommunicati vitandi sunt.

Qui per publicam Ecclesiæ denunciationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiæ præcisus et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine, donec per pœnitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit arbitrio Judicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

XXXII.

Excommunicate persones are to bee avoided.

That persone, whiche by open denunciacion of the Churche, is rightlie cut of from the vnitie of the Churche, and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faiethful, as an Heathen and publicaine, until he bee openlie reconciled by penaunce, and receiued into the Churche by a Judge that hath aucthoritie thereto.

XXXIII.

Traditiones Ecclesiasticæ.

Traditiones atque cæremonias easdem non omnino necessarium est esse ubique, aut prorsus consimiles, nam variæ et semper fuerunt et mutari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate; modo nihil contra Dei verbum instituatur.

Traditiones et cæremonias Ecclesiasticas, quæ cum Verbo Dei non pugnant et sunt authoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens et data opera publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem Ecclesiæ, quique lædit authoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, pub-

XXXIII.

Tradicions of the Churche.

It is not necessarie that tradicions and ceremonies bee in all places one, or vtterlie like. For at al times thei haue been diuers, and maie bee chaunged, according to the diversitie of countries and mennes maners, so that nothing bee ordeined against goddes worde.

Whosoever through his priuate iudgement willinglie, and purposelie doeth openlie breake the tradicions and ceremonies of the Churche, whiche bee not repugnaunte to the worde of God, and bee ordeined, and approved by common aucthoritie, ought to be rebuked openlie (that other maie feare to doe the like) as one that

lice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

offendeth against the common ordre of the churche, and hurteth thaucthoritie of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weake brethren.

XXXIV.

Homiliæ.

Homiliæ nuper Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ per injunctiones Regias traditæ atque commendatæ, piæ sunt atque salutares, doctrinamque ab omnibus amplectendam continent: quare populo diligenter, expedite, clareque recitandæ sunt.

XXXIV.

Homilies.

Thomelies of late geuen, and set out by the kinges auchoritie, be godlie and holsome, conteining doctrine to be receiued of all menne, and therefore are to be readde to the people diligentlie, distinctlie, and plainlie.

XXXV.

De Libro Precationum et cæremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.

Liber qui nuperrime authoritate Regis & Parliamenti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ traditus est, continens modum & formam orandi, & Sacramenta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: similiter & libellus eadem authoritate editus de ordinatione ministrorum Ecclesiæ, quoad doctrinæ veritatem, pii sunt, & salutari doctrinæ Evangelii in nullo repugnant sed congruunt, & eandem non parum promovent & illustrant, atque ideo ab omnibus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ fidelibus membris, & maxime a ministris verbi cum omni promptitudine animorum & gratiarum actione, recipiendi, approbandi, & populo Dei commendandi sunt.

XXXV.

Of the booke of Praiers, and Ceremonies of the Church of Englande.

The Booke whiche of very late time was geuen to the Churche of Englande by the kinges auchoritie, and the Parlamente, conteining the maner and fourme of praiying, and ministring the Sacramentes in the Churche of Englande, likewise also the book of ordring Ministers of the Churche, set foorth by the forsaied auchoritie, are godlie, and in no poincte repugnaunt to the holsome doctrine of the Gospel but agreable thereunto, ferthering and beautifiying the same not a litle, and therfore of al faithfull membres of the Churche of Englande, and chieflie of the ministers of the worde, thei ought to be receiued, and allowed with all readinesse of minde, and thankes geving, and to bee commended to the people of God.

XXXVI.

De civilibus Magistratibus.

Rex Angliæ est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ & Hibernicæ.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc Regno Angliæ. Magistratus civilis est a Deo ordinatus atque probatus, quamobrem illi, non solum propter iram sed etiam, propter conscientiam, obediendum est.

Leges civiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia & gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet ex mandato Magistratus arma portare & justa bella administrare.

XXXVI.

Of Civile magistrates.

The king of Englande is Supreme head in earth, nexte vnder Christe, of the Churche of Englande, and Jrelande.

The Bishoppe of Rome hath not iurisdiction in this Realme of Englande.

The ciuile Magistrate is ordeined, and allowed of God: wherefore we must obeie him, not onely for feare of punishment, but also for conscience sake.

The civile lawes maie punishe Christien men with death, for heinous, and grieuous offences.

It is lawefull for Christians, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and to serve in laweful wares.

XXXVII.

Christianorum bona non sunt communia.

Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia, quoad jus et possessionem, ut quidam Anabaptistæ falso jactant; debet tamen quisque de his quæ possidet pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

XXXVII.

Christien mennes gooddes are not commune.

The richesse and gooddes of Christians are not commune, as touching the right title and possession of the same (as certain Anabaptistes dooe falslie boaste); notwithstanding euery man ought of such thinges as he possesseth, liberallie to geue almes to the pore, according to his habilitie.

XXXVIII.

Licet Christianis jurare.

Quemadmodum juramentum vanum & temerarium a Domino

XXXVIII.

Christien menne maie take an Othe.

As we confesse that vaine, and rashe swearing is forbed Christien

nostro Jesu Christo & ab Apostolo ejus Jacobo, Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur, ita Christianum religionem minime prohibere censemus, quin jubente Magistratu, in causa fidei & charitatis jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in Justitia, in Judicio et veritate.

men by our Lorde Jesu Christ, and his Apostle James : so we iudge that christien religion doeth not prohibite, but that a man maie sweare, when the magistrate requireth in a cause of faith, and charitie, so it bee doen (according to the Prophetes teaching) in iustice, iudgemente, and trueth.

XXXIX.

Ressurrectio mortuorum nondum est facta.

Resurrectio mortuorum non adhuc facta est, quasi tantum ad animum pertineat qui per Christi gratiam a morte peccatorum excitetur, sed extremo die quoad omnes qui obierunt, expectanda est ; tunc enim vita defunctis (ut Scripturae manifestissime testantur) propria corpora, carnes & ossa restituentur, ut homo integer, prout vel recte vel perdite vixerit, juxta sua opera, sive præmia sive pœnas reportet.

XXXIX.

The Resurrection of the dead is not yeat brought to passe.

The Resurrection of the dead is not as yet brought to passe, as though it only belonged to the soulle, whiche by the grace of Christe is raised from the death of sinne, but it is to be loked for at the last daie : for then (as Scripture doeth moste manifestlie testifie) to all that bee dead their awne bodies, fleshe, and bone shall be restored, that the whole man maie (according to his workes) haue other rewarde, or punishment, as he hath lived vertuouslie, or wickedlie.

XL.

Defunctorum animæ neque cum corporibus intereunt, neque otiose dormiunt.

Qui animas defunctorum prædicant usque ad diem judicii absque omni sensu dormire, aut illas asserunt una cum corporibus mori, & extrema die cum illis excitandas, ab orthodoxa fide, quæ nobis in sacris literis traditur, prorsus dissentiunt.

XL.

The soulles of them that departe this life doe neither die with the bodies, nor sleep idlie.

Thei whiche saie, that the soulles of suche as depart hens doe sleepe, being without al sence, fealing or perceiuing vntil the day of iudgement, or affirme that the soulles die with the bodies, and at the laste daie shalbe raised vp with the same, doe vtterlie dissent from the right beliefe declared to vs in holie Scripture.

XLI.

Millenarii.

Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, sacris literis adversantur, & in Judaica deliramenta sese praecipitant.

XLI.

Heretics called Millenarii.

Thei that goe about to renewe the fable of hereticks called Millenarii, be repugnant to holie Scripture, and caste them selues headlong into a Juishe dotage.

XLII.

Non omnes tandem servandi sunt.

Hi quoque damnatione digni sunt, qui conantur hodie perniciosam opinionem instaurare, quod omnes, quantumvis impii, servandi sunt tandem, cum definito tempore a justitia divina œnas de admissis flagitiis luerunt.

XLII.

All men shall not bee saued at the length.

Thei also are worthie of condemnacion, who indeuoure at this time to restore the dangerouse opinion, that al menne be thei neuer so vngodly, shall at length bee saved, when thei have suffered paines for their sinnes a certain time appoincted by Goddes iustice.

ARTICLE I

De Fide in Sacrosanctam Trinitatem.

Unus est vivus et verus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensæ potentiæ, sapientiæ, ac bonitatis : Creator et conservator omnium tum visibilium tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinæ naturæ tres sunt Personæ, ejusdem essentiæ, potentiæ, ac æternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

This first Article has remained without any alteration since the publication of the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI. in 1553, in which series it occupied the same position as it does in our own set. Its language may be traced ultimately to the Confession of Augsburg,[1] the terms of which on this subject were adopted almost verbatim in the Thirteen Articles of 1538, agreed upon by a joint-committee of Anglican and Lutheran Divines. The same language re-appears also in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, cap. 2.

[1] Art. 1. "*De Deo.*—Ecclesiæ magno consensu apud nos docent decretum Nicenæ Synodi, de unitate essentiæ, et de tribus personis, verum et sine ulla dubitatione credendum esse. Videlicet, quod sit una essentia divina, quæ appellatur et est *Deus æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensa potentia, sapientia, bonitate, Creator et Conservator omnium rerum visibilium et invisibilium, et tamen tres sint personæ ejusdem essentiæ potentiæ, et coæternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus:* et nomine personæ utuntur ea significatione qui usi sunt in hac causa scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit." The words in italics are repeated almost verbatim in our own article.

The need of such an Article as this is shown by the formidable spread of Anabaptism in this country as well as on the Continent. Contemporary documents show how very many of the Anabaptists had lost all faith in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Some were reviving the Sabellian heresy, and denying that there was more than one Person in the Godhead; others were teaching a form of Arianism, denying the Divinity of the Second Person, while others again maintained that Christ was "a mere man."[1]

The article falls into two main divisions. The first part treats of the existence of God, and the "necessary"[2] doctrine of the divine unity. The second speaks of the mode of God's existence, and the distinctions within the divine nature.

The statement in the first part, that **there is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible,** expresses a belief which is not peculiar to Christianity, but is common to both natural and revealed religion, and is held by every serious Theist, as well as every believer in the Christian revelation. It is not therefore a doctrine

[1] The reality of the danger and the character of the heresies prevalent is shown by the closing words of the Article in the Confession of Augsburg: "Damnant omnes hæreses, contra hunc Articulum exortas, ut Manichæos, qui duo principia ponebant, bonum et malum. Item Valentinianos, Arianos, Eunomianos, Mahometistas, et omnes horum similes. Damnant et Samosatenos, veteres et neotericos, qui, cum tantum unam personam esse contendant, de verbo et de Spiritu Sancto astute et impie rhetoricantur, quod non sit personæ distinctæ, sed quod Verbum significat verbum vocale, et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum."

[2] By saying that the unity of God is "necessary" it is meant that the contrary is inconceivable. "Two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings than one is a clear contradiction."—Pearson *On the Creed*, Article 1, ch. ii. § 13.

for which "Scripture proof" will be sought. The existence and unity of God is assumed and taken for granted throughout Scripture. Indeed, Scripture will have no force or weight to anyone who has not first on other grounds accepted this truth. Thus the consideration of the several "proofs" of God's existence belongs to the study of "evidences," and would be out of place in a commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles. It is therefore not considered necessary to enter into it here, but the reader will find in the foot-note reference to a few recent works in which the whole subject is discussed.[1]

The second part of the Article, **And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,** states in the briefest possible terms the great truth taught us by Revelation concerning the nature of God, the acceptance of which distinguishes Christianity from Judaism, Mohammedanism, Unitarianism, and all other forms of religious belief.

The subject will be best considered under the following heads :—

1. The grounds on which the doctrine is accepted.
2. The history of the doctrine in the Church, and the growth of technical phraseology in connection with it.
3. The explanation of the doctrine.

I. *The Grounds on which the Doctrine is accepted.*

Our belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity rests entirely on the revelation made by God in Holy Scripture.

Flint's *Theism* and *Anti-Theistic Theories.* Bishop Ellicott's *Being of God.* See also Mozley's *Essays, Historical and Theological*, vol. ii.; Essays on *The Argument of Design* and *The Principle of Causation* ; and Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iv.

Intimations that distinctions of some sort exist in the divine nature may be discerned in the Old Testament, but the proof of the doctrine can only be sought in the teaching of the Gospels. Without a direct revelation from God man could never by his reason have discovered that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, but when once this is disclosed man can see that it is not merely not contrary to reason, but rather that it satisfies the demands of his reason, and fits in with his deepest thoughts on the nature of God. Though "not discoverable by reason," it is yet "agreeable to reason."[1]

(*a*) *The preparation for the revelation of the mystery under the Old Covenant.*—To guard the truth of the *unity* of God, and to bear a never-failing witness to it in the midst of idolatry and polytheism, was the special function of the Jewish Church. "Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut. vi. 4) forms the central declaration of the Old Covenant, standing to it in much the same relation that the command to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost stands in to the Christian Church. It is, therefore, not to be expected that the doctrine of *Personal* distinctions within the Godhead will be prominently brought forward in the Old Testament. The unity must first be established and firmly fixed in the minds of God's chosen people before the further revelation can be safely made and the existence of distinct persons within the Godhead be disclosed without fear of leading men to polytheism. And yet throughout the Old Testament the thoughtful reader will from time to time discern the presence of hints, suggestions, and anticipations of the truth subsequently made known in its fulness through the incarnate Son. There are three verses in the early chapters of Genesis in which devout

[1] Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 134.

minds have often found an adumbration of the doctrine of the Trinity, namely, Gen. i. 26, "And God said, Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"; iii. 22, "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as *one of us*, to know good and evil"; xi. 7, "And the Lord said . . . go to, let *us* go down, and there confound their language." So also in Isaiah vi. 8, we read, "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us*." Various interpretations of these passages have been proposed. Some have explained the plural as that used by monarchs in speaking of themselves in decrees, etc., but this explanation is now generally rejected, as not in accordance with Hebrew usage. The majority of modern commentators prefer the view which refers the plural to the angels, as if God announced to them His resolve to create man. It is, however, difficult to hold this view without supposing that a co-ordinate share in the act of creation is granted to the angels, which is quite inadmissible,[1] and it is by no means clear that the patristic interpretation of these passages which sees in them an adumbration of the doctrine of the Trinity is incorrect. Again, the believer, who reads the Old Testament in the light of the New, may well see a foreshadowing of the doctrine in the threefold repetition of the divine name in Aaron's blessing, Num. vi. 24-26, "The LORD bless thee and keep thee; the LORD make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the LORD lift up His countenance upon thee and give thee peace"; as well as in the song of the seraphim in Isaiah vi. 3, "Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of Hosts"—an utterance which has become the "Tersanctus" of the Christian Church (cf. Rev. iv. 8).[2]

[1] See, however, Spurrell's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis*, p. 14.

[2] Cf. the thrice-repeated refrain in Ps. xcix. 3, 5, 9, which is really an echo of the song of the seraphim. "Holy is He . . . Holy is He . . . Holy is the Lord our God." See the R.V. Nothing is said in the

All these passages, however, though they may appeal forcibly to those who have already accepted the doctrine can scarcely serve for proof of the doctrine to the unbeliever. For purposes of controversy no high value can be attached to them. The real line of preparation for the disclosure of the mystery must be sought elsewhere. It will be found in a study of those passages in which God is spoken of in His covenant relation to man, acting upon him, and revealing Himself to him, in a twofold manner.

There is first that which may be called the "external" manifestation, by means of the messenger or "angel of the LORD," who speaks now as God, and now as one sent by God, so that the angel is in part identified with Jehovah, and in part distinguished from Him. Thus we read that "the LORD appeared" to Abraham, and "lo, three men stood over against him." Then follows the account of the manifestation, and then we read that "the men turned from thence, and went towards Sodom; and Abraham stood yet before the LORD . . . And the LORD went His way, as soon as He had left communing with Abraham: and Abraham returned to his place. And the two angels came to Sodom" (Gen. xviii. 1; xix. 1). Plainly, then, one of the three was a more exalted Being than "the two angels," and represented "the LORD." Again in Joshua v. 14, a mysterious being

text of the name *Elohim*, a plural form in which some would see a reference to the doctrine, because it is now generally agreed that it is simply the plural of majesty or intensity. It has been truly pointed out that "those who adduce it as an anticipation of the doctrine of the Trinity appear to forget that this use of the plural *does not stand alone* in Hebrew; the words אדון and בעל meaning *lord*, *master*, are often used in the plural with reference to a single human superior (*e.g.* Ex. xxi. 4, 6, 8, 29); and Isaiah (xix. 4) describes the conqueror of Egypt as אדונים קשה, where the adjective is singular, but the substantive is plural."—S. R. Driver, in the *Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. iii. p. 42.

appears to Joshua, and announces himself as "Captain of the LORD'S host," and immediately afterwards we read of Him as "the LORD"; for "the LORD said to Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, etc." (See also Gen. xvi. 7 *seq.*; xxii. 11, 14; xxiv. 7, 40; xxxi. 11–13; Ex. iii. 2 *seq.*; xiii. 21; xiv. 19; xxxii., xxxiii.) There is no need to consider here the oft-discussed question which of the two views of the "Angel of the LORD" is correct—(1) That which has the support of most of the Greek Fathers, from Justin Martyr onwards, and of some of the Latins, namely, that the angel is actually the Logos, or Second Person of the Holy Trinity, thus manifesting Himself before the Incarnation; or (2) that which was advocated by St. Augustine, and is adopted by most moderns, namely, that he is a created angel, acting as the direct representative of Jehovah. In either case God's presence is specially manifested through him, and thus there is a real preparation for the revelation of God in Christ, and the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.[1] In this connection reference must also be made to those numerous passages from which the Jews of Palestine constructed their doctrine of the Logos, the Word, or "Memra," which represents the personal action of God, and which is found in the Targums in many places where the communion of God and man has to be expressed. For instance, in the oldest Targum, that of Onkelos, Adam is represented as hearing the voice of the *word* of the Lord in the garden (Gen. iii. 8); the Lord protects Noah by His *word* when he enters the ark (vii. 16), and at Sinai, Moses brings forth the people to meet the *word* of God (Ex. xix. 17). In all such passages we can see that "the Palestinian instinct seized upon the concrete idea of "the word

[1] On the "Angel of the Lord," see Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 188 *seq.*, and Medd's *Bampton Lectures*, Note vii. p. 426.

of God,' as representing His personal action, and unconsciously prepared the way for a gospel of the Incarnation.[1]"

But, further, there was, under the Old Covenant, yet another mode in which God disclosed Himself to man, through what may be termed an "internal" revelation. God is frequently spoken of as acting or working *in* man by means of His Spirit, a power proceeding from Him, not yet revealed as a distinct person, though in some passages there is an approximation to this, which must have led men's minds in the direction of the revelation afterwards made. Thus, throughout the Old Testament, the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Jehovah, is represented as the principle of the life of man's soul, and every natural and intellectual gift in man is traced back to it. (See Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4; Gen. xli. 38; Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31.) It is the Spirit which is the source of inspiration (Numb. xi. 25; Isa. lxi. 1), and the principle of sanctification (Ps. li. 10–12, cxliii. 10). Even the special title given to the Third Person of the blessed Trinity under the New Dispensation is prepared for under the Old Covenant, for in two passages the Spirit of God is spoken of under the name of God's Holy Spirit.

"Cast me not away from Thy presence, and take not *Thy Holy Spirit* (LXX. *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν σου*) from me" (Ps. li. 11). "But they rebelled, and grieved *His holy Spirit* (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ*): therefore He was turned to be their enemy, and Himself fought against them. Then He remembered the days of old, Moses, and His people, saying, Where is He that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of His flock? where is He that put His holy Spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) in the midst of them" (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11).[2]

[1] Westcott on *S. John*, p. xvii.

[2] Outside the canonical books the title occurs again in Wisdom ix. 17.

Thus, although it would be an error to read the complete doctrine of the New Testament into the Old, yet it is undeniable that the way was prepared for it under the Old Covenant, and that the teaching of Holy Scripture on the Angel of the Lord and God's Holy Spirit foreshadows distinctions within the Godhead, which were subsequently revealed as *Personal.*

(*b*) *The revelation of the mystery in the New Testament.* —When we pass from the Old Testament to the New we find that we no longer have to content ourselves with faint adumbrations of the doctrine, but that it is clearly indicated that the distinctions within the Godhead are personal. And yet, as it has been truly said, "there is no moment when Jesus Christ expressly reveals this doctrine. It was overheard rather than heard. It was simply that in the gradual process of intercourse with Him, His disciples came to recognise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as included in their deepening and enlarging thought of God."[1] Almost the earliest intimation was that made at our Lord's baptism, when there came from heaven the voice of the *Father*, testifying to the beloved *Son*, upon whom *the Spirit* descended like a dove (S. Matt. iii. 13–17). And from this time onwards we can trace the gradual disclosure of the truth throughout our Lord's teaching. All through His ministry He taught His disciples to regard His relation to His heavenly Father as unique, showing that His Sonship was something peculiar, different from the sonship which they themselves could claim. His language implied that, though personally distinct from the Father, He was yet one with Him, and so Himself divine. So with increasing clearness,

"And Thy counsel who hath known, except Thou give wisdom, and send *Thy Holy Spirit* from above." See also Wisdom i. 5 and Ecclus. xlviii. 12, where Codex A reads, Ἐλισαῖε ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου.

[1] Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 131.

towards the close of His ministry, He spoke much of the Holy Spirit, and in terms which can only be satisfied if the Spirit be a divine Person. This is seen above all in the discourses spoken in the upper chamber on the eve of the Passion (S. John xiii.–xvi.), where the fullest revelation of the Person and work of the Spirit is given. And, finally, the doctrine is summed up and handed on to the Church in the great commission given after the resurrection, "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" (S. Matt. xxviii. 19). The passage forms the central declaration,[1] and contains our Lord's complete revelation of the doctrine. The first two titles, the *Father* and the *Son*, are plainly personal titles; they speak of a personal relation, and would be misleading did they not imply that those to whom they are applied are personally distinct. And if the first two titles are personal, it will be felt that the third must be personal too.[2] Again it is inconceivable that any but divine titles could be so joined with the title of the everlasting Father, while the fact that baptism is into the *name*, not *names*, implies the unity of the Three. Thus in this text are involved these three great truths—(1) The unity of God, (2) the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and (3) their distinct personality; and these three truths go to make up the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

It is impossible to give an adequate summary of the

[1] The removal of 1 John v. 7 from the Revised Version makes it unnecessary to refer further to this text, the spuriousness of which is now almost universally acknowledged.

[2] The force of this will be easily estimated by substituting the name of an *attribute* of God for one or other of the words used by our Lord. It is inconceivable that we should be bidden to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of *the providence of God*. A *personal* title is a necessity.

scriptural evidence for the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit without anticipating what properly belongs to the commentary on Articles II. and V. It will, therefore, not be attempted here. Nor does it seem necessary to prove that the apostles were not Tritheists. The unity of God is assumed throughout the New, as throughout the Old Testament.[1] All, therefore, that it will be needful to do in this place is to indicate various passages where the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned together as personal agents, performing distinct offices, leaving the reader to gather the full scriptural proof of the doctrine from what is said further on concerning the Second and Third Persons of the Holy Trinity.

Reference has already been made to S. Matt. iii. 13–17; xxviii. 19, and the discourses in S. John xiii.–xvi. Besides these, attention should be drawn to the closing benediction of 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." Such language seems quite inconsistent with any belief save that which the Church has always held. Again, S. Paul writes to the Romans: "I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me" (Rom. xv. 30). To the Ephesians he declares: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv. 4). Passages such as these —and they might easily be multiplied to a great extent —are sufficient to show not merely that there are distinctions of some sort in the divine nature, but that

[1] See S. Mark xii. 32; 1 Cor. viii. 4; Gal. iii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; S. James ii. 19; S. Jude, 4, 25.

these distinctions are personal. The Spirit whose "love" and "communion" and "fellowship" are spoken of can only be a person; and of none but *divine* Persons could the language just cited be used. It finds its only adequate explanation in the belief that "in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

To conclude this part of our subject. The witness of Scripture to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity has never perhaps been better summed up in a short compass than in the opening words of the prayer with which St. Augustine concludes his great treatise "On the Trinity." "O Lord our God, we believe in Thee, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. For the truth would not say, 'Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' unless Thou wast a Trinity. Nor wouldest Thou, O Lord God, bid us be baptized in the name of Him who is not the Lord God. Nor would the divine voice have said, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,' unless Thou wert so a Trinity as to be one Lord God. And if Thou, O God, wert Thyself the Father, and wert Thyself the Son, Thy Word, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit your gift, we should not read in the book of truth, 'God sent His Son'; nor wouldest Thou, O only-begotten Son, say of the Holy Spirit, 'Whom the Father will send in My name'; and 'whom I will send to you from the Father.'"[1]

(*c*) *The doctrine agreeable to reason.*—The doctrine of the Holy Trinity must always be based on the teaching of Holy Scripture. The only questions we are at liberty to ask relate to the evidence for the

[1] St. Aug. *De Trinitate*, bk. xv. ch. xxviii.

revelation. If it is clear that the doctrine is contained in Holy Scripture, and that the Holy Scripture is a revelation from God, then the doctrine must be received, not as "reasonable" nor as "unreasonable," but simply as scriptural. It is only from what God has disclosed to us of Himself and His eternal Being that we are entitled to affirm the existence of personal distinctions within the divine nature. But, still, when once the doctrine has been revealed it can be shown to be "agreeable to reason," and to harmonise with and throw fresh light upon man's deepest thoughts of God. Our whole conception of God is an unworthy and impoverished one unless we regard Him as in His essence love. But if He be indeed essentially and eternally love, it would seem to follow of necessity that there must be a plurality within the Godhead. Love requires an object on which to spend itself. It is only conceivable as "a personal relationship of a lover and a loved"; and unless God only *became* love when His creative work was begun, He must have found within His divine Being one toward whom His love could eternally flow forth. And that which reason is thus seen to demand is supplied in the Christian doctrine of "the Word" which "was in the beginning with God," and which "was God." In the only-begotten Son, who is revealed to us as from all eternity "in the bosom of the Father," is found the eternal object of the divine love.

Whether we can go further than this, and say that reason suggests that there are more than two Persons within the Godhead may be doubtful. It has appeared indeed to many thoughtful minds that certain considerations almost necessitate a Trinity. It has been pointed out that our own personality is necessarily triune, and that if we are to think of God as personal, we must regard Him as possessing in transcendent perfection

the same attributes which are imperfectly possessed by man, and as therefore triune.[1] Again, where there is a subject and an object there must be that which unites them. So some have felt that reason points not only to the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son, but to the Eternal Spirit, the bond of love that unites them. But there is no need to press such considerations as these. They will probably never appeal forcibly to any but the few who are philosophically trained. Without laying stress on them we may well be content to find that reason is so far in harmony with revelation as to suggest that at least there are personal distinctions of some sort within the Godhead, and that our God is no "monotonous unity," no "lonely" God, but one who is eternal love.[2]

II. *The History of the Doctrine in the Church and the growth of Technical Phraseology in connection with it.*

When we pass from Holy Scripture to the writers of the early Christian Church we find ample proof that from the very first the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was held and believed, although the belief was what may be called an *implicit* and informal one. The Church was content to believe without defining. Nor did she at first feel the need of technical phraseology, or terms to express with accuracy the relation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the exact character of the unity. In the earliest days, therefore, we hear nothing of such terms as "Trinity," "Three Persons," or "One Substance." But still we can clearly see not only that the faith of the Church was monotheistic, but also that the Son and Holy Spirit were believed in as God, and yet were

[1] Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 74.

[2] See on the whole subject Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 67 *seq.* and Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 134 *seq.*

not confused with or merged in the Person of the Father. Thus Clement of Rome, the earliest of the Fathers, writing before the close of the first century, says: "As God liveth and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Ghost, who are the faith and hope of the elect."[1] The language of Ignatius more especially on the Divinity of the Christ is most emphatic,[2] while in some passages of his epistles the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned together in such a way as to show that Ignatius recognised real distinctions within the Godhead.[3]

During the latter half of the second century the language of the Fathers begins to be somewhat more precise and formal,[4] and recognised terms now make their appearance. The word Trinity is the earliest. The

[1] Clem. Rom., *Ad Cor.* i. ch. lviii.; cf. ch. xlvi., "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that is shed forth upon us?"

[2] *E.g.*, "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto her that hath found mercy in the bountifulness of the Father most high, and of Jesus Christ His only Son; to the Church that is beloved and enlightened through the will of Him who willed all things that are, by faith and love towards Jesus Christ our God." *Ad Rom.* ch. i.; cf. ch. vi., "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God."

[3] Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* ch. ix., "Ye are stones of a temple, which were prepared beforehand for a building of God the Father, being hoisted up to the heights through the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, and using for a rope the Holy Spirit." *Ad Magnes.* ch. xiii., "Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and of the Apostles, that ye may prosper in all things whatsoever ye do in flesh and spirit, by faith and by love, in the Son and Father and in the Spirit."

[4] Nothing is said in the text of the well-known passage in Justin Martyr's first Apology (ch. vi.) in which he appears to include the angels as objects of the Christian's worship, placing them *before* the Holy Ghost, because there is evidently some error connected with it; cf. Otto's note, *in loc.* As Professor Swete observes: "Certainly no writer, catholic or heretical, would have intentionally represented the Holy Spirit as *inferior* to angels; so that the passage, if pressed against S. Justin's orthodoxy, proves too much."—*Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost*, p. 17.

Greek *Τριάς* is found for the first time in the works of Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 180), who speaks of the first three days of creation as "Types of the Trinity, of God, and of His word, and of His wisdom."[1] The Latin word *Trinitas* occurs a few years later in the writings of Tertullian, himself the first *Latin* writer of the Church,[2] and from his days onwards it is used as a well-known term.[3]

Athenagoras, one of the Greek apologists who wrote about 176, uses language which shows that the relation of the three Persons of the Godhead was beginning to attract attention. "Who would not marvel to hear men call us atheists, although we speak of God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and set forth at once their power in unity (*τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν*), and their distinction in order" (*τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν*).[4] But it was not till the rise of false teaching forced the orthodox to say what they meant by their belief that the terms Person and Substance came into use. During the last quarter of the second century two formidable heresies arose, in meeting which the Church was compelled to enlarge her vocabulary, and make use of more precise and definite language with regard to the Godhead than she had hitherto done. When Theodotus and Artemon[5] taught that Christ was "a mere man" (*ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον*), it became necessary to bring into even greater

[1] *Ad Autolycum.* ii. sec. 15, *τύποι τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ.*

[2] *Adv. Praxeam*, ch. iii.

[3] So S. Cyprian speaks of the Jews as having observed three hours of prayer, "Sacramento Trinitatis."—*De Dom. Orat.* ch. 34.

[4] Legat. x.

[5] On the heresy of the Artemonites, see *Eusebius*, V. ch. xxviii. Artemon taught at Rome at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. He was excommunicated by Pope Zephyrinus (A.D. 198–217).

prominence than before the truth which had been held all along that He is essentially divine. When, on the other hand, Praxeas [1] taught that Christ was *personally* one with the Father, so that it was actually the Father who suffered on the cross in the *character* of the Son, the Church in denying this was compelled to say *what* she held the distinctions within the Godhead to be. The particular form of heresy of which Praxeas appears to have been the originator is sometimes called Patripassianism, from the fact that its advocates asserted that the person of the Father suffered in Christ; and sometimes Sabellianism, from a teacher who refined somewhat on the teaching of Praxeas. Its essential feature consists in the denial that the distinctions in the Godhead are personal, and the assertion that they are merely distinctions of character, phenomenal rather than real.

It is only after the rise of these two heresies that the terms Person and Substance begin to come into prominence. The teaching of Artemon was characterised as a "God-denying apostasy." It was met by a threefold appeal, to Holy Scripture, to the traditional teaching, and to the worship of the Church; and it was shown that the essential divinity of Christ had been believed in by the Church from the beginning.[2] But then, as the orthodox thus met the teaching of Artemon, they were confronted with the assertions of the Sabellians, who, accepting the truth of Christ's Divinity, erred in denying His personal distinction from the Father, and charged those who maintained it with Tritheism, or belief in three Gods. To meet this charge it became necessary not only to dwell on the unity, but also to explain of what kind the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was

[1] Our knowledge of Praxeas is chiefly due to Tertullian's work against him. For the character of his teaching see especially ch. i.

[2] See *Eusebius*, V. xxviii.

held to be. So, in order to defend himself from anything like Tritheism, Tertullian lays down that the Son is *of one substance* (*unius substantiæ*) with the Father.[1] By early Greek Fathers the nature or essence of the Godhead which is communicated to the Son and Holy Spirit from all eternity was expressed by two words—*ousia* (*οὐσία*), and *hypostasis* (*ὑπόστασις*). Some among the Alexandrians especially have employed the former word to denote the "essence" or "substance" of the Godhead, while elsewhere among the Greeks hypostasis was sometimes used with *the same meaning*.[2] But while the unity was thus established, it was also necessary to define more closely in what the distinctions within the Godhead consist. The Sabellians taught that they were merely distinctions of character. In opposition to this erroneous teaching the Church was driven to enlarge her terminology. She was compelled to explain what she meant by her Creed, and forced to say what was to be understood by her assertion that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were "three." Three *what*? This question was persistently asked, though it is clear that the Church at first shrank from answering, feeling that no one human term was adequate to express exactly what she under-

[1] *Adv Praxeam*, ch. ii.: "Nihilominus custodiatur *οἰκονομίας* sacramentum, quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, *unius* autem *substantiæ* et unius status et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur."

[2] Clement of Alexandria has *οὐσία*, *Strom.* ii. 2, 5; iv. 25, 163; v. 10, 66. Still earlier, Justin Martyr had spoken of the Son as not being separated from the *οὐσία* of the Father, *Dial.* ch. 128. Origen also has *οὐσία*. *In Joann.* x. 21, *De Orat.* 23, and so have the Alexandrian Dionysius, and Alexander. *ὑπόστασις* is used by Dionysius of Rome (Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iii. p. 373), as well as by Gregory Thaumaturgus (cf. Basil, *Ep.* 210, 5). It is also the term generally employed by Athanasius himself for "substance," though in one of his earlier works he speaks of "three Hypostases."—See Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 90.

stood the language of Scripture to teach. She would have preferred to remain content with expressing the unity by the neuter of the pronoun, saying that the Father and the Son were *unum*, not *unus*, and the distinction by the masculine; yet Tertullian, in writing against Praxeas, is at last compelled to use the word *Persons, Personæ*.[1] Hippolytus, a little later, uses πρόσωπα, its true Greek equivalent.[2] Origen, however, employing hypostasis in a different sense from that in which it had been generally used by the Church, speaks of there being more hypostases than one in the Godhead,[3] thus making it the equivalent of Person, and using it to express the distinction. It will be seen from what has now been said that a door was opened to confusion of thought, the word hypostasis being taken in two different senses, in one of which it expressed an entirely different conception from the Latin *substantia*, its true etymological equivalent. Hence, in the fourth century, two questions arose with regard to ὑπόστασις.

(*a*) Is there one, or are there three in the Godhead?

(*b*) What is its Latin equivalent?

(*a*) The use of the word *Ousia* for "Substance" was naturally brought more into prominence by the language formally adopted at Nicæa (325) against the Arian

[1] *Adv Praxeam*, ch. vii.; cf. ch. xii.: "Alium autem quomodo accipere debeas jam professus sum, *personæ*, non substantiæ, nomine, ad distinctionem non ad divisionem. Ceterum ubique teneam *unam substantiam* in tribus cohærentibus, etc."

[2] *Contra Hæresim Noeti*, ch. vii. xiv.; *Philosoph.* ix. 12.

[3] In *Joann.* ii. 6, ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν. *Contra Celsum*, viii. 12. Cf. Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 163. "The word for Person in Origen is commonly *Hypostasis*, that for the divine nature is less determinate, but is frequently *ousia*." Yet Origen also uses οὐσία to express the distinctions: *De Orat.* 15, ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενόν ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός, as also did Pierius of Alexandria (see Photius, Codex 119).

heresy, which denied the eternal Divinity of the Son. In the Creed which was there promulgated, it was stated that the Son was "Only-Begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father" (*μονογενῆ τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός*), and again that He is "of one substance with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί*). But in the anathemas appended to the Creed, the use of *ὑπόστασις* as an equivalent for *οὐσία* was recognised, for those were condemned who said that the Son was of "a different substance or essence" from the Father (*ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἤ οὐσίας*). Consequently, this older use of the word hypostasis for Substance lingered on side by side with the more recent use, in which it was taken as meaning Person. It is obvious that such a double use of a single term might lead to misconception and misunderstanding. Those who took hypostasis as identical in meaning with *ousia*, would charge anyone who spoke of "three Hypostases" with Arianism or Tritheism, and might fairly appeal to the Nicene anathema in support of their views; while, on the other hand, those who were familiar with the use of the word in the sense of Person would regard the assertion that there was but "one Hypostasis" in the Godhead as pure Sabellianism. And this is, in fact, what actually happened. The trouble arose at Antioch in connection with the Meletian schism. And, together with other questions raised by that schism, it was brought before the Council of Alexandria in 362. There the question of terminology was inquired into, and, by the wise moderation of Athanasius, the trouble was set at rest. Both parties stated their views before the Council, and were cross-examined as to the meaning of the terms they employed. The result was, that it was speedily made manifest that both were perfectly orthodox. "One Hypostasis" was not intended to be Sabellian, nor was "three Hypostases" meant to express Arian views. Ac-

cordingly, it was agreed that each party might retain its own usage, since questions of words must not be suffered to divide those who think alike.[1] By this wise decision any danger of a schism on account of the varying terminology was avoided. But still some inconvenience could not but be felt at this double use of the term hypostasis now as "Person," and now as "Substance." This was gradually removed by the general adoption of the phraseology first employed by Origen. *Πρόσωπα* gradually dropped out of use, *ousia* was universally employed to denote the substance, and hypostasis was restricted to mean the distinctions,[2] and thus in the end all the Greeks united in the formula, *μιὰ οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*.[3]

(*b*) Meanwhile, in the west, some difficulty had arisen with regard to the word to be used to express the distinctions within the Godhead. *Substantia* was, of course, the true etymological equivalent of hypostasis; and, indeed, hypostasis, in the sense of substance or essence, seems to have been originally adopted by the Greeks as its translation. When, then, the Greek hypostasis had had a new meaning stamped upon it, and was used as equivalent to Person, what were the Latins to do? Were they to alter their terminology as the Greeks had done, or to continue to use the expression which had come down to them with the authority of the earlier Fathers, such as Tertullian? Some few Latin writers, such as Hilary of Poictiers, attempted to assimilate their

[1] See Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, sec. 5 *seq.*, in Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 484.

[2] Although at Sardica (343), as at Nicæa, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* had been treated as identical, yet they are carefully distinguished in the synodal letter sent from Constantinople in 382, which speaks of *οὐσία μία . . . ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν, ἤτοι τρισὶ τελείοις προσώποις*.

[3] *Οὐσία* signifying *τὴν φύσιν τῆς Θειότητος*, and *ὑποστάσεις* expressing *τὰς τῶν τριῶν ἰδιότητας*.—Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xxi. 46, with which cf. Hooker, V. li. § 1.

terminology to that of the Eastern Church, and spoke of "*tres substantiæ*," [1] but such language never found favour in the west. It could not safely be used without a great deal of explanation, and to most minds would be immediately suggestive of Arianism. Consequently it soon dropped out of use. It is vehemently rejected by Jerome [2] and Augustine, the latter of whom speaks as if the phraseology was firmly fixed as *una essentia* or *substantia*, and *tres personæ*, by the time when he wrote his great work on the Trinity (A.D. 416).[3] And in the use of these terms the Western Church since then has never varied.

There is no need to pursue the history of the doctrine further. There have, it is true, from time to time been serious controversies within the Church as to its exact meaning, and incautious language has sometimes been used, that was perilously near to Tritheism on the one hand and Sabellianism on the other.[4] But there has been no change or wavering on the part of the Church

[1] Hilary, *De Synodis*. He is, however, very careful to explain his language. "Idcirco tres substantias esse dixerunt, subsistentium personas per substantias edocentes, non substantiam Patris et Filii diversitate dissimilis essentiæ separantes."—Vol. ii. p. 480.

[2] *Ep. ad Damasum*, xv., where he gives an account of the trouble in which he was involved in Syria, because of his refusal to speak of "three Hypostases," a refusal which he bases on the ground that, "in the whole range of secular learning, hypostasis never means anything but essence."

[3] S. Aug. *De Trinitate*, V. ix.

[4] For the later history of the doctrine reference may be made to Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii. p. 209, and vol. iii. p. 327. In the eleventh century the nominalism of Roscellinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while Abelard's teaching drew upon him the charge of Sabellianism. For the controversy in the seventeenth century between Dr. South and Dean Sherlock, in which charges of Sabellianism were again raised, see Perry's *English Church History*, pt. ii. p. 564; and on Waterland's masterly vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity, in opposition to the Arianism of Dr. Clarke and others, see Abbey and Overton's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, ch. viii.

as to the terms to be used in the expression of her faith. We pass therefore to the last subject to be considered in connection with this article.

III. *The Explanation of the Doctrine.*

In considering what is to be said in explanation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity it must ever be borne in mind that the terms used by the Church, *μία οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, *una substantia tres personæ*, "one substance, three persons," are simply chosen by her in order to express as accurately as possible what she believes to be the real meaning of the statements of the Holy Scripture, in which our Lord revealed all that can be known by man of the divine nature. As we study the language in which our Lord speaks of Himself, and His relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit, it becomes clear that there are two principal dangers to be guarded against—(1) that of *exaggerating* the distinctions and so separating the "Persons," and (2) that of *explaining away* the distinctions, so as ultimately to deny their reality. In other words, we are exposed on the one hand to the danger of 'confounding the Persons," as the Sabellians did; on the other to that of "dividing the substance," as did the Arians and Socinians of a later day. The sketch given above of the growth of technical phraseology will have shown that the term Persons was only fixed upon to express the doctrine after much hesitation; because it became absolutely necessary, in the face of heresy, to use *some* term to describe what the Church meant by her teaching on "the Three in the Godhead"; and this term, though not altogether satisfactory, came nearer than any other to express what she understood Holy Scripture to teach. The matter is well put by Augustine in the following passage in his work on the Trinity:—

"Many writers in Latin who treat of these things, and are of authority, have said that they could not find any other more suitable way by which to enunciate in words that which they understood without words. For, in truth, as the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father, and that Holy Spirit, who is also called the gift of God, is neither the Father nor the Son, certainly they are three. And so it is said in the plural, 'I and the Father are one.' For He did not say, '*is* one,' as the Sabellians say, but '*are* one.' Yet, when the question is asked, *what* are the three? human language labours altogether under great poverty of speech. The answer, however, is given, 'three *Persons*,' not that that might be spoken, but lest nothing should be said."[1]

It is clear, then, from this confession that the term "cannot be employed without considerable intellectual caution."[2] We must guard against taking it in the sense of *character*,[3] and also against thinking of three *separate* existences, such as we think of when the ex-

[1] "Non audemus dicere unam essentiam, tres substantias; sed unam essentiam vel substantiam; tres autem personas, quemadmodum multi Latini ista tractantes et digni auctoritate dixerunt, cum alium modum aptiorem non invenirent quo enunciarent verbis quod sine verbis intelligebant. Re vera enim cum Pater non sit Filius, et Filius non sit Pater, et Spiritus Sanctus ille qui etiam donum Dei vocatur, nec Pater sit nec Filius, tres utique sunt. Ideoque pluraliter dictum est, *Ego et Pater unum sumus.* Non enim dixit, unum est, quod Sabelliani dicunt; sed, *unum sumus.* Tamen cum quæritur quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dictum est tamen tres personæ non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur."—*De Trinitate*, V. ix.; cf. VII. vi. And S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa.* 1*a*, Q. 29 *a*, 3, "Conveniens est ut hoc nomen (*persona*) de Deo dicatur; non tamen eodem modo quo dicitur de creaturis, sed excellentiori modo."

[2] Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 32.

[3] It was probably for this reason that the Greek Church discouraged and finally altogether discarded the use of the term πρόσωπον as the equivalent of *persona*.

pression is applied to three men. "The word Person, used in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, would on first hearing suggest Tritheism to one who made the word synonymous with *individual*; and Unitarianism to another, who accepted it in the classical sense of a *mask* or *character*."[1] The Church, it is needless to say, means neither of these. All that she intends to express by the use of the term "three Persons" is that which she understands Holy Scripture to teach, namely, that there are *three eternal distinctions in the divine nature, anterior to, and independent of any relation to created life.*[2]

1. That the distinctions are eternal is clearly taught in such a passage as S. John i. 1. "The Word," which was in the beginning with God" (*πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*) must have been distinct from God (*ὁ Θεός*), and yet "the Word was God" (*Θεός*). And were there no other passages bearing on the subject the saying of our Lord recorded in S. John xvii. 5 ("the glory which I had with Thee before the world was") would of itself be sufficient to show that the Trinity is not merely "economic"—*i.e.* God did not *become* a Trinity when He manifested Himself to mankind as Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier—but that it is "immanent," *i.e.* an eternal fact in the divine nature, altogether independent of relation to creation. The Son must have been a distinct Person "before the world was," if He then possessed a "glory" of His own "with the Father."

2. But while it is thus taught in Scripture that the Persons are eternally distinct, it is implied with equal clearness that though distinct they are not "separate." Our Lord's own deliberate utterance maintained His unity with the Father. "I and the Father are one." *Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν* (S. John x. 30). "Every

[1] Newman's *Arians*, p. 442.

[2] See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures, ubi supra.*

word," says Bishop Westcott, "in this pregnant clause is full of meaning. It is *I*, not *the Son*; *the Father*, not *my Father*; one essence (ἕν, Vulgate *unum*), not one person (εἷς, *unus*); *are*, not *am* . . . It seems clear that the unity here spoken of cannot fall short of unity of essence. The thought springs from the equality of power (*My hand, the Father's hand* [see vers. 28, 29]); but infinite power is an essential attribute of God; and it is impossible to suppose that two beings distinct in essence could be equal in power."[1] Here then, in the compass of this brief utterance, we find a full and satisfactory refutation of both Arianism and Sabellianism. "Per *unum* Arius, per *sumus* Sabellius refutatur."[2] The plural verb emphasises the distinction of Persons, while the neuter, ἕν (*unum*), brings out the truth which the Church has expressed in saying that the Son is "of one substance with the Father," that is, partaker of His eternal and essential nature.

3. But, further, while Holy Scripture in this way reveals to us the unity of the divine nature, there is another truth also taught in it which requires to be carefully kept before the mind, if the full teaching of the Church is to be realised. This is the truth that the Father is alone unoriginate, the fount of Deity in the eternal life of the Trinity. There is perhaps a danger lest we should represent to ourselves a sort of abstract "Godhead," behind the three Persons, and think that of it all three equally partake, so that in it is to be found their source and origin. Against any such erroneous notion the Church has guarded by the doctrine of the *Monarchia*, which teaches that the Father is the only source or ἀρχή, the sole Fount of Deity (πηγὴ θεότητος) from which the Son and Holy Ghost from all eternity derive their divine

[1] *Commentary on S. John's Gospel, in loc.*
[2] Bengel.

being.[1] "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself" (S. John, v. 26). "The living Father hath sent Me, and I live because of the Father" (*διὰ τὸν πατέρα*, ch. vi. 57). In virtue of this the Father is rightly said to be the First Person of the Holy Trinity, by a priority, not of time, but of order. To quote Bishop Pearson on this subject:

"As there is a number in the Trinity by which the Persons are neither more nor less than Three, so there is also an order by which of these Persons the Father is the First, the Son the Second, and the Holy Ghost the Third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the Second unto the First, and of the Third unto the First and Second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though, therefore, this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father is First, and the Son Second. Again the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son; though, therefore, this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father, who is the First Person, cannot be the First; receiving the same from the Son, who is the Second, cannot be the Second, but, being from the First and Second, must be of the Three the Third."[2]

[1] Cf. Athanasius, *Orat. Contr. Arian.* iv. ch. i. *μία ἀρχὴ θεότητος καὶ οὐ δυὸ ἀρχαὶ ὅθεν κυρίως καὶ μοναρχία ἐστίν.*

[2] Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Article VIII. § 22; cf. Article I. ch. iii. § 11.

To this divine "subordination" it is probable that our Lord referred when He said to His disciples, "The Father is greater than I" (S. John, xiv. 28). In one sense it is, of course, true that if the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, "none is greater or less than another," for the Godhead does not admit of degrees, and of "more" or "less." And accordingly many divines have understood the words of our Lord just cited to refer to Him as incarnate, as they are apparently taken in the Athanasian Creed: "Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood." But it is also true that there is a sense in which the Father, as the Source of all the Divinity of both Son and Spirit, is "greater" than either. "The Son is the Father's equal, as partaker of His nature. He is His 'Subordinate' in that this equality is eternally derived." [1]

4. There is one other truth taught in Holy Scripture, which the Church has summarised in a definite theological term, in order to guard fully the unity of the Holy Trinity. It is the doctrine of the *Περιχώρησις*, or *Coinherence*, the mutual indwelling of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity. The doctrine is based on the words of our Lord in S. John xiv. 10, 11, "The Father abiding in Me (*ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων*) . . . I am in the Father and the Father in Me"; with which should be compared S. Paul's words of the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor. ii. 11, "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." The meaning of the doctrine is well stated by Bishop Bull, from whose words it will be clearly seen that it

[1] Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 234. See Westcott, *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, detached note on ch. xiv. 28, for a full summary of Patristic references to this text.

effectually guards the faith of the Church from any approach to Tritheism, and secures her belief in the unity of the Godhead:—

"The Father is the principle of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and both are propagated from Him 'by an internal, not by an external, production,' from which it results that they are not only *of* the Father, but *in* the Father, and the Father in them; and that in the Holy Trinity one Person cannot be separated from the other, as three human persons are divided from one another; for they who hold that the three Hypostases of the Godhead are in this way separate are rightly called Tritheists . . . The Father and the Son are in such sense One, as that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; and that the one cannot be separated from the other. This mode of union the Greek theologians call περιχώρησις, and the Latins, *i.e.* the schoolmen, circuminsession . . . περιχώρησις and circuminsession may be said to be that union by which one thing exists in another, not only by participation of its nature, but also by a full and intimate presence. This kind of inexistence, so to speak, our divines call circuminsession; because by it certain things, however much they may be mutually distinguished from each other without being separated, do yet exist in each other without confusion, and as it were flow into each other."[1]

[1] Bull's *Ante-Nicene Faith*, bk. iv. ch. iv. § 9; cf. Newman's *Arians*, p. 178 *seq.*; and Athanasius, *Arian Orations*, iii. ch. xxiii., with Newman's Notes.

ARTICLE II

De Verbo, sive Filio Dei, qui verus homo factus est.[1]

Filius qui est Verbum Patris, ab æterno a Patre genitus, verus et æternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero beatæ Virginis ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duo naturæ, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personæ, fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctæ: ex quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus et verus homo: qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia[2] non tantum pro culpa originis verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

Of the Word or Son of God which was made very man.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

THE original article in the series of 1553 was identical with our present one, except that in it the clause on the eternal generation and Divinity of the Son ("Begotten . . . of one substance with the Father") was wanting. It was drawn almost word for word from the third of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which, in

[1] The title in the editions of 1553 and 1563 was *Verbum Dei verum hominem esse factum*, "that the Word or Son of God was made very man."

[2] This word is wanting in the Latin edition published by Wolfe in 1563, by the express authority of the Queen. It is, however, found in the editions of 1553, in the Parker MS. of 1563, and in the editions of 1571. The omission was therefore probably due to an accidental error of the press.

its turn, was taken entirely from the Confession of Augsburg.[1]

The clause on the eternal generation and Divinity of the Son was inserted in the edition of 1563 by Archbishop Parker, being suggested by the corresponding article in the Confession of Würtemburg.

This article, like the previous one, was aimed against the Anabaptists, many of whom were unsound on the cardinal doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, reviving the Arian heresy, while others had adopted peculiar and heretical notions of the Incarnation,[2] and others again rejected altogether the doctrine of the Atonement, denying that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, and actually venturing to speak of Him as "a mischievous fellow and deceiver of the world."[3]

So early as 1535 we find that fourteen Anabaptists were condemned to the stake, for maintaining, among other things, that "in Christ is not two natures, God and man; and that Christ took neither flesh nor blood of the Virgin Mary";[4] and as late as 1579, one Matthew Hamant was burnt at Norwich for teaching that "Christ is not God nor the Saviour of the world, but a mere man, a sinful man, and an abominable idol."[5]

[1] *Conf. August.* iii., "*De Filio Dei.* Item docent quod Verbum, hoc est Filius Dei, assumpserit humanam naturam in utero beatæ Mariæ Virginis, ut sint duæ naturæ, divina et humana, in unitate personæ inseparabiliter conjunctæ, unus Christus, vere Deus et vere homo, natus ex Virgine Maria, vere passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, ut reconciliaret nobis Patrem, et hostia esset non tantum pro culpa originis sed etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis. Item descendit ad inferos," etc.

[2] See the passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, "De hæresibus," ch. 5, quoted below on Article IV. p. 182.

[3] See the striking letter of Bishop Hooper, quoted above in the Introduction, p. 22.

[4] Stow's *Chronicle.*

[5] Hollinshed, and cf. Strype, *Annals*, vol. iii. p. 557, for a similar case a few years later.

There are three principal subjects considered in this article, which falls accordingly into three principal clauses—

1. The Divinity and eternal generation of the Son.
2. The Incarnation.
3. The Atonement.

I. *The Divinity and eternal generation of the Son.*

"The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father." Each expression in this clause requires careful consideration.

The Son. Bishop Pearson[1] points out that there are four subordinate senses in which this title is given to our Lord. He is the Son—

(*a*) As born of the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary. See S. Luke i. 35: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God."

(*b*) As designed by God's special will to His high office. See S. John x. 34–36: "If He called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), say ye of Him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

(*c*) As raised by God from the dead. See Rom. i. 4: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." Cf. Acts xiii. 33.

(*d*) As appointed heir of all things. See Heb. i. 2–5: "His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things . . .

[1] Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. II. ch. iii.

having become by so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they."

But though in all these senses it may be said that the title Son belongs to Him, they are, however, but inferior and improper senses; for the title is properly given to Him, not for anyone of the reasons just given, but *because He has the divine essence communicated to Him by the Father from all eternity.* In this sense He is God's "own Son," and God is His "own Father."[1] The title belongs to Him, therefore, in His divine nature. Prior to the Incarnation, prior to the creation, He has from all eternity been the Son in this sense, in that He derives His Divinity from the Father, who, as was shown under the last article, is alone unoriginate (*ἄναρχος*), the Son being indeed God, but (as the Nicene Creed reminds us) by proceeding from God. "God *of* God, Light *of* Light, very God *of* very God" (*Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φῶτος, Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ*).

Which is the Word of the Father. The personal title of Word, or Logos, is given to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity only in S. John i. 1, 14, and Rev. xix. 13 ("the Word of God," cf. however Heb. iv. 12 and 1 John i. 1). The reader will scarcely expect a discussion of its meaning and significance here. For this he will naturally turn to the Commentaries on S. John's Gospel.[2] It will be sufficient for our purpose here to point out how this title at once suggests the *eternity* of Him to whom it is applied, for it is impossible to conceive of the Father as ever *ἄλογος*, without that eternal Thought or Reason, which is the Son. Thus the two titles, Son and Word, as it has often been pointed out, supplement and reinforce each other; and, taken

[1] See S. John v. 18: *Πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν*, and Rom. viii. 32: *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο.*

[2] See especially Westcott on *S. John's Gospel* Introd. p. xv.

together, guard and protect the full truth concerning the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. Either of them standing alone might have seemed to sanction error. While the title Son suggests *personal distinction*, it might, if it stood alone, have been pressed into the service of Arianism, as if it implied that the Son was of more recent origin than the Father. "The Word," on the contrary, although of necessity conveying the idea of *eternity*, does not necessarily suggest Personality, and thus might have been appealed to as sanctioning Sabellianism. But when the two titles are combined, the possible misapplication of either of them is at once avoided. The Son, who is also the Word, must be eternal. The Word, who is also the Son, must be a distinct Person.[1]

Begotten from everlasting of the Father (*ab æterno a Patre genitus*). If the Second Person of the Holy Trinity is from all eternity the Son, it follows that He is "begotten from everlasting"; and thus *eternal generation* is the term used by the Church to express the manner in which the divine essence is communicated by the Father to the Son. It must never be understood as if it referred to an "event" which "once" took place, for it is intended to denote not an act but an eternal and unchangeable fact in the divine nature. The precise term is apparently due to Origen, who says ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀεὶ γεννᾶται, the Saviour is ever begotten;[2] and similarly Augustine says: "Semper gignit Pater, et semper nascitur Filius."[3] Such expressions are, however, founded on the language of revelation, for Holy Scripture

[1] See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 234, and cf. Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. 472, Note 1.

[2] *Opera*, vol. iv.; S. Pamphili Martyris, *Apologia*, ch. iii.; cf. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iv. p. 354.

[3] *Ep.* 238.

not only speaks of the Second Person of the Trinity as "the Son," but also applies to Him the terms "begotten" and "only begotten."[1] The latter term (*μονογενής*) is used several times by S. John (i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9), but by no other writer of the New Testament. Elsewhere S. John also speaks of Him as "begotten" (*γεγεννημένος* and *γεννηθείς*; see 1 John v. 1, 18.) S. Paul employs another phrase to express the same idea, when he speaks of Him as "the First-born of all creation" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15).[2]

The very and eternal God (*Verus et æternus Deus*). It became necessary to use such adjectives after the rise of the Arian heresy in the fourth century, for the Arians were willing to allow that in some sense Christ might be termed God, though they denied that He was of one substance with the Father, and maintained that "once" He did not exist (*ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*). Thus, on the Arian hypothesis, He is neither *true* (*verus*, very), nor *eternal* God. Hence in the Nicene Creed it was found necessary to state emphatically that He is "very God of very God," and the use of the similar phrase in the article before us is probably due to the revival of the Arian heresy by the Anabaptists. To the same cause we may also trace the need for the next expression employed in the article.

Of one substance with the Father (*Patri Consubstantialis* = *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*). This is the distinctive symbol of the Catholic faith against Arianism, first inserted in the Creed at the Council of Nicæa (325). Not that the adoption of the term marked any change in the faith of the Church. The faith was "once for all

[1] The term is applied to Him, *ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς μόνως ἐγεννήθη*. S. John Damascene.

[2] On this passage and its true meaning, see Lightfoot's Commentary, *in loc.*

delivered to the saints" (S. Jude, 3), and there can be no change in it, nor addition to it. The only "development" of which it admits is a development by *explanation*, not a development by *addition*. The old faith may need restating in new terms and a somewhat fuller definition, in order to guard against misinterpretation. But this is all; and nothing more than this was attempted at Nicæa. "The Nicene divines," says Liddon, "interpreted in a new language the belief of their first Fathers in the faith. They did not enlarge it; they vehemently protested that they were simply preserving and handing on what they had received. The very pith of their objection to Arianism was its novelty; it was false because it was of recent origin. They themselves were forced to say what they meant by their Creed, and they said it. Their explanation added to the sum of authoritative ecclesiastical language, but it did not add to the number of articles in the Christian faith: the area of the Creed was not enlarged. The Nicene Council did not vote a new honour to Jesus Christ, which He had not before possessed: it defined more closely the original and unalterable basis of that supreme place which, from the days of the apostles, He had held in the thought and heart, in the speculative and active life of Christendom."[1]

After what was said under the first article on the history and meaning of the terms *Ousia* and *Hypostasis*, there is no need to explain further the meaning of the word *Homoousios*, "of one substance." But it may be

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 429; cf. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 96. "These decisions do, it is contended, simply express in a new form, without substantial addition, the apostolic teaching as it is represented in the New Testament. They express it in a new form for protective purposes, as a legal enactment protects a moral principle. They are developments only in the sense that they represent the apostolic teaching worked out into formulas by the aid of a terminology which was supplied by Greek dialectics."

well to emphasise the fact that it was not adopted at Nicæa without anxious consideration. It was open to several objections, which the Arians were not slow to urge. The following were the principal ones:—

1. It was said to be a novelty, and not found in Scripture.

2. It was a philosophical term; as such it had been used by heretics, and it implied a divine substance distinct from God, of which the persons partook.

3. It had been rejected at the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, A.D. 268.

4. It was of a Sabellian tendency.

Of these objections the *first* was met by pointing out that, even if the term were novel, its *meaning* was not; and though it was not actually found in Scripture, yet it did but sum up the doctrine of Scripture on the nature of the Son of God. "In it," says Athanasius, "the Bishops *concentrated the sense of the Scriptures.*"[1] As a matter of fact, however, the term was not such a novelty as the Arians tried to make out, and precedents for its use were quoted from early writers, notably Dionysius of Rome and his namesake of Alexandria in the third century.[2]

With regard to the *second* objection, it was made abundantly clear that the Church was not using the term in the sense in which it had been used by philosophers. She did not intend to imply that there was any substance distinct from God. She only used the term "to express the real Divinity of Christ, and that as being derived from and one with the Father's."[3]

[1] Athanasius, *Def. Nic. defin.* ch. v. § 20.

[2] Athanasius, *ubi supra.* Eusebius of Cæsarea himself confesses the antiquity of the word ("Epistola Eusebii in Socrates," *H. E.* I. viii.). Origen apparently had made use of the word (*Pamphili Apol.* 5), and so had Theognostus, while so early a writer as Tertullian has its Latin equivalent "*unius substantiæ*" (see above, p. 107).

[3] Newman's *Arians*, p. 191.

The *third* objection was disposed of by showing that if the Fathers at Antioch rejected the word it was because Paul of Samosata had attempted sophistry, and taking the word in its philosophical sense had argued that it implied that there were three substances, one the previous substance, and the other two derived from it. Its rejection, if a fact, was due to the desire to guard against this. At Nicæa, on the contrary, its adoption was necessitated by the evasions of the Arians. At Antioch it would have obscured the truth and led to misconception, whereas at Nicæa it was required to protect the faith from error of a different character.[1]

The *fourth* and last objection was removed by a careful explanation of the sense in which the word was really used, and by the gradual adoption of the word Hypostasis, to express the real distinctions within the Godhead, in which the Church believed.

In this manner all the objections raised to the use of the term were met, and it was insisted upon and clung to by the orthodox party, not from any feeling of obstinacy or prejudice, but simply because experience taught them that it was the one term which the subtlety and ingenuity of the Arians was unable to pervert or explain away, and which expressed without ambiguity the truth that needed to be so jealously guarded, the truth, that is, of the absolute and essential Divinity of the Son of God.

We have now considered separately each expression in the first part of the article. Before, however, proceeding to our second subject it is necessary to give a brief summary of *the scriptural evidence of the Divinity of the Son.*

1. In the first place, it may be shown that our Lord's own claims are such that it is impossible to think of Him except as one who is God. At first, no doubt, this

[1] See Athan. *De Synodis*, 43, and cf. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 430.

would not have been realised by those around Him; but as they listened to His teaching, heard Him set His claims above those of the nearest and dearest of personal relations,[1] assume as of right a power to extend or even to abrogate the provisions of the Mosaic law,[2] assert Himself as "greater than Jonah," "greater than Solomon,"[3] "greater than the temple,"[4] claim Himself to give rest to the weary and heavy-laden, speak of a knowledge of the Father possessed by none other,[5] declare that He would come again "in His glory and the glory of the holy angels," and sit on the throne of judgment,[6] they must have wondered with an increasing wonder who it was who could make such tremendous claims.

Nor was this all. They saw Him work His miracles, and as He healed the sick, or cast out devils, they heard Him *in His own name* bid the sick arise or the devils depart.[7] Miracles had been wrought by others before. They were wrought by the apostles themselves. But it was *in their Master's name* that the devils were subject unto them.[8] And when they bade the sick arise it was again in His name. "Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole" (Acts ix. 34). Very striking is it to contrast the Lord's words to the evil spirit, "Thou deaf and dumb spirit, I command thee (ἐγώ σοι ἐπιτάσσω) come out of him" (S. Mark ix. 25), with St. Peter's disclaimer in Acts iii. 12, "Why marvel ye at this? or why look ye on us as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk." So again, they saw that He *accepted worship*, by whomsoever it was offered to Him;[9]

[1] S. Matt. ix. 37.
[2] S. Matt. v. 22 *seq.*, xix. 8 *seq.*
[3] S. Matt. xii. 41, 42.
[4] S. Matt. xii. 6.
[5] S. Matt. xi. 27–30.
[6] S. Matt. xxv. 31.
[7] S. Mark ix. 25; S. Luke vii. 14.
[8] S. Luke x. 17.
[9] S. Matt. viii. 2 (the leper); ix. 18 (the ruler of the synagogue); xiv.

though "worship" as every Jew was taught from his childhood was the prerogative of God alone, and must be rejected not only by men (see Acts x. 25, xiv. 15), but even by angels (see Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9).

Again, when He spoke of His relation to the Father, they heard Him distinctly assert His union with Him ("I and the Father are one," S. John x. 30), and speak of the "glory which" He "had with" Him "before the world was" (S. John xvii. 5). They heard Him claim a timeless pre-existence before Abraham had come into being, and in so doing appropriate as His own the special title of Jehovah under the Old Covenant "I am" (*πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι*, S. John, viii. 58). Very instructive also is the discourse in S. John v., in connection with which the Jews sought to kill Him, "because He not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God His own Father, *making Himself equal with God.*" Thus His opponents understood Him to claim Divinity, and He did not utter a single word that would lead them or His own disciples to suppose that their inference was wrong. "Intelligunt Judæi quod non intelligunt Ariani" is the striking and suggestive comment of Augustine on the passage. Thus, as the apostles listened to such language, and heard such claims advanced as those which have been very briefly summarised here, it must gradually have dawned upon them that their Master was not only as one of the prophets of old; they realised at last that He was the Messiah for whom all Jews were looking, and that He was in a unique and special sense the Son of God. Peter was but the mouthpiece of them all when

33 (those with Him in the boat); xv. 25 (the Syro-Phœnician woman); xx. 20 (the mother of Zebedee's children); xxviii. 9. 17 (the women and disciples after the resurrection); St. Mark v. 6 (the Gadarene demoniac). The force of the argument is best seen by contrasting these passages with those referred to in the text where apostles and angels refuse with horror the "worship" offered to them.

He confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (S. Matt. xvi. 16). Even this confession, however, great as it is, falls short of the full acknowledgment of His eternal Godhead, for in spite of indications which may to us appear not obscure,[1] it does not seem that the Jews were looking for a *divine* Messiah.[2] But when the crowning proof of divine power was given by the resurrection from the dead, then there came the conviction, never afterwards lost, expressed in the words of Thomas, which were accepted by our Lord as the true expression of faith in Him, "Thomas saith unto Him, *My Lord and my God*" (S. John xx. 28).[3]

2. In considering the evidence for the Divinity of our Lord the first place must always be given to His own words and claims. Although, as Bishop Westcott says, "He never speaks of Himself directly as God," yet "the aim of His revelation was to lead men to see God in Him."[4] That the apostles did thus finally apprehend the aim of His revelation is shown by the words of Thomas quoted above; but the full proof that they had grasped the bearing of His teaching and recognised His Eternal Godhead must be sought in their teaching and language concerning Him, preserved in the Acts and Epistles, as well

[1] *E.g.*, not only are such names as "Immanuel" (Isa. vii. 14), and "Jehovah is our righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 6) given to Him. These need not denote more than the fact that through Him Jehovah would manifest Himself, but in Isa. ix. 6 He is spoken of as "the mighty God," El Gibbor, a title given to Jehovah Himself, in the very next chapter (x. 21), and in Micah v. 2 it is said that "His goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

[2] See Ryle and James on the *Psalms of Solomon*, p. lv.

[3] The argument from the claims of our Lord and His "self-assertion" is sometimes put in the form of the dilemma, "Aut Deus aut homo non bonus," a dilemma from which there appears no way of escaping. See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iv.; cf. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 9–17; and for a good popular statement of the position, *The Great Dilemma*, by the Rev. H. B. Ottley.

[4] *Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, note on St. John xx. 28.

as in the Gospels. The summary of the evidence for this will be best presented under separate heads, as follows:

(*a*) The great dogmatic passages in the Pauline Epistles in which the person and nature of Christ are fully dwelt upon. Three such are of special importance.

Phil. ii. 6–8: "Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God: but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea the death of the cross."

The main subject of this passage is the Incarnation; but the apostle states very clearly who He was who became incarnate. He was One who was, to begin with, in the form of God (*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*), and yet such was His humility, that He did not consider His equality with God (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*), a thing to be grasped at, to be claimed at all hazards, but he "emptied Himself." etc. The *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*, as Bishop Lightfoot points out, denotes the reality, the characteristic attributes of the Godhead, exactly as the "form of a servant" (*μορφὴν δούλου*), which he "took," indicates the reality of the human nature. And the whole passage implies very clearly that He who was incarnate in time, existed before the worlds in the eternal Godhead.

Col. i. 15–18: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, . . . all things have been created through Him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*) and unto Him; and He is (*αὐτός ἐστι*) before all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence." Here the apostle is claiming for the

[1] See Lightfoot on *Philippians*, p. 108 *seq.*

Son absolute supremacy in relation to the universe (vers. 15–17), and the Church (ver. 18), and He starts by speaking of His relation to the invisible God, of whom He is the "image" (*εἰκών*), a term which implies not mere likeness, but actual representation and manifestation. He then attributes to Him the work of creation of all things, both visible and invisible, and finally claims for Him a pre-existence before all time. "He is before all things."[1] Such claims could not, without blasphemy, be made on behalf of any creature, however glorious. He, of whom the apostle makes such assertions, can only be Himself God.

A similar passage, the witness of which is not less clear, is found in Hebrews i. 2 *seq.*, where the work of creation is again attributed to the Son, who is also said to be "the effulgence of the Father's glory and the very image of His substance" (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*), and contrasted with the angels, none of whom is ever addressed in Scripture as Lord, or God, as is the Son in Ps. xlv. 7 and cii. 25, as quoted by the writer of the epistle.

(*b*) The last-mentioned reference to the Old Testament (Ps. cii. 25) leads us naturally to another point, which brings out, in a most striking fashion, how completely the apostles assumed the Divinity of Christ. In Ps. cii. there is no reference to the Messiah. It is Jehovah of whom the Psalmist is speaking, and yet the writer of the epistle applies his words to Christ. Nor does the passage stand alone, for it will be found that several *passages, which in the Old Testament are directly spoken of Jehovah, are in the New Testament cited as referring to Christ*, a fact which implies that the writers who thus cited them *identified Christ with Jehovah. E.g.* Isaiah (ch. vi.) saw the glory of Jehovah. S. John, after speaking of *Christ*, says definitely, "These things

[1] Lightfoot on *Colossians*, p. 209 *seq.*

said Isaiah, when he saw *His* (viz. Christ's) glory, and spake of Him" (xii. 41). Zech. xii. 10 is quoted in S. John xix. 37 of the crucifixion of Jesus, but on turning to the prophet we discover that Jehovah is the speaker, who says, "They shall look unto *Me*, whom they have pierced."[1] And once more S. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 15) takes up the words of Isaiah viii. 13 ("Sanctify the LORD of Hosts"), and says directly, "Sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts" (*κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*), where LORD is, without the shadow of a doubt, intended to represent the sacred name of Jehovah, of the Old Testament.[2] It has been said, not without truth, that if the word Lord had been written in capital letters in the New Testament, wherever it represents Jehovah, as it is written in the Old Testament, Socinianism would have been an impossibility.

(*c*) Further, an appeal may be made to those *passages in which Christ is directly termed God.* Foremost among these will stand the opening verses of S. John's Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God (*πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*), and the Word was God (*Θεός*) . . . the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." Here He who was incarnate is expressly identified with that "Word" which "was God," and a few verses lower down, according to a very probable reading (noted in the margin of the Revised Version), S. John calls Him God again, for in the 18th verse, where we read, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him," many very ancient authorities read "God only begotten" for "only begotten Son.[3] Next to this

[1] It is possible, however, that with many Hebrew MSS. we ought to read "Him," and not "Me."

[2] Cf. Rom. x. 9–13 with Isa. xxviii. 16 and Joel ii. 32.

[3] See Westcott's *Commentary*, *in loc.*, and Hort's *Two Dissertations.*

may stand Romans ix. 5: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." For though, as the margin of the Revised Version tells us, "some modern interpreters place a full stop after flesh, and read He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever," yet such a rendering appears to be nothing but an evasion of the plain meaning of the words, for, as so careful and accurate a scholar as Dean Vaughan says, it introduces "a harsh and abrupt transition, for which there is no cause and no parallel."[1] Other passages to which reference may be made are the following: Acts xx. 28, "The Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood" (here, however, the text cannot be regarded as certain, some ancient authorities reading "the Lord" for "God"). Titus ii. 13, where the *natural* rendering of the words, *τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* is that of the Revised Version, "Our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," applying to Him the titles, God and Saviour. So also in 2 Pet. i. 1, *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, it is difficult to think any rendering correct except that of the Revised Version, "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."[2]

(*d*) Lastly, we have the incidental witness of passing statements, in which divine attributes and actions are ascribed to Christ, and prayers and doxologies are addressed to Him. See Acts vii. 59; 2 Cor. v. 10 (where the office of judging the world is assigned to Christ); xii. 8, 9 (where St. Paul prays to Him, *ὁ κύριος*

The reading *μονογενὴς Θεός* is definitely accepted in Westcott & Hort's *Greek Testament*.

[1] *Commentary on Romans*. See also note in *Speaker's Commentary, in loc.*, and Sanday and Headlam's exhaustive note in *The International Commentary*.

[2] In 1 Tim. iii. 16 it seems quite clear that the reading *Θεός* is not genuine, but even so, the *pre-existence* of Christ is implied in the word *ἐφανερώθη*. In 1 John v. 20 the words *ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός may refer* to "Jesus Christ," but their reference is not certain. See Westcott's *Commentary, in loc.*

from the context can only be Christ whose "strength" is to "rest upon" the apostle); Eph. i. 20–23; Heb. vii. 3, xiii. 8; and the doxologies in Rev. i. 5, v. 9–14.

II. *The Incarnation.*

"The Son . . . took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and the manhood, were joined together in One Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man."

As in the earlier part of the article so here the exact expressions used require careful notice. They are selected so as to exclude the three principal forms of heresy which have arisen on the doctrine of the Incarnation. Of the four great "Christological" heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, the earliest, that of Arius, denying the true Divinity of Christ, has been already excluded by the opening words of the article. The three remaining ones, those of Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches, are effectually guarded against by the section before us. Of these three heresies, that of Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, was the earliest, following close upon the Arian, and being condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381. It "maimed" the humanity of Christ. Adopting the threefold division of man's nature (body, soul, and spirit, 1 Thess. v. 23) Apollinaris admitted that Christ possessed both body and soul, by which latter term he meant the *anima animans*, the lower faculties common to man with the brute creation, but he denied to Him the *anima rationalis*, the higher "spirit," including the intellectual and spiritual powers. Of this he said He had no need, for its place was supplied by the divine Logos. Thus, on this theory, Christ could not be said to be *perfect* man, for an essential part of manhood, the

higher spiritual nature, was wanting. Such teaching obviously affects the whole conception of Christ's redemptive work. If the humanity was incomplete and imperfect, the redemption would be incomplete, and imperfect, too, for the nobler part of man's nature, although needing redemption no less than the body, should have no part nor share in it.

The heresy of Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, which was condemned at the Third General Council at Ephesus, 431, involved the assertion that there were *two persons* in Christ. According to Nestorius, the blessed Virgin could not rightly be termed *Theotocos* (mother of God), for she gave birth only to a human person, who was conjoined with the divine Son of God. "He who was formed in the womb of Mary," said Nestorius, "was not Himself God, but God 'assumed' Him, and on account of Him who assumed, He who is assumed is also called God." This heresy involves, even more than Apollinarianism, the virtual destruction of the atonement, for if in Christ there be two persons, one divine and the other human, it was only "a man" who died on the cross, and not a divine Person, whereas it is really "the infinite worth of the Son of God," that is "the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation, by that which Christ either did or suffered as man in our behalf."[1]

Eutychianism, the last of these heresies, was condemned at the Fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon in 451. Historically it was a reaction against Nestorianism. Eutyches, from whom it takes its name, was a monk of Constantinople, who in his anxiety to avoid maintaining anything approaching to a twofold personality in Christ, was led to assert that after the Incarnation there was but *one nature* in Him, for he thought that the human nature became so merged in the divine, as to be absorbed

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. v. ch. lii. § 3.

by it, and no longer to remain distinct. Thus he denied that *two whole and perfect natures* remained in Christ, and so did away altogether, not only with the value of Christ's example, but also with all possibility of acknowledging the redemption of *man*, because, according to him, He who suffered and died was in no way qualified to represent man, as being in no true sense human.

It was in the course of the controversies called forth by these heresies that the Church was led to formulate the doctrine of the Incarnation, in the terms which are adopted in the article. The Person of the Son of God is from all eternity. At the Incarnation no new person came into being. But He who as God the Son had existed from all eternity, "took man's nature upon Him in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance," and from henceforth has existed not only as God, but also as man, "two whole and perfect natures, the Godhead and manhood," being inseparably united in His single Personality. This union of the two natures in one Person is termed the *hypostatic union*, a union, that is, in a single hypostasis, or personal self. That the two natures are thus united in one Person is plainly taught in Holy Scripture, for it is solely owing to the *unity of person* in Christ that in speaking of Him divine and human titles can be freely interchanged. St. Paul speaks of "the Church of *God* which *He* purchased with *His own blood* (Acts xx. 28), thus sanctioning by implication the phrase, "the blood of God." Our Lord Himself while on earth described Himself as "the Son of *Man*, which is *in heaven*" (St. John iii. 13),[1] and St. Paul charges the Jews with having "*crucified the Lord of Glory*" (1 Cor. ii. 8). In such expressions there is attributed to Christ, spoken of by a divine title, that which belongs only to

[1] It ought to be added that the last words, "which is in heaven," are of doubtful genuineness. They are omitted in the Revised Version.

humanity, and conversely, when a human title is employed, a divine attribute is ascribed to Him.

"A kind of mutual commutation there is, whereby these concrete names, God and man, when we speak of Christ, do take interchangeably one another's room, so that for truth of speech it skilleth not whether we say that the Son of God hath created the world, and the Son of Man by His death has saved it, or else that the Son of Man did create, and the Son of God die to save the world. Howbeit, as oft as we attribute to God what the manhood of Christ claimeth, or to man what His deity hath right unto, we understand by the name of God and the name of man neither the one nor the other nature, but the whole person of Christ, in whom both natures are. When the apostle saith of the Jews that they crucified the Lord of Glory, and when the Son of Man being on earth affirmeth that the Son of Man was in heaven at the same instant, there is in these two speeches that mutual circulation before mentioned. In the one there is attributed to God, or the Lord of Glory, death, whereof divine nature is not capable; in the other, ubiquity unto man, which human nature admitteth not. Therefore by the Lord of Glory we must needs understand the whole Person of Christ, who being Lord of Glory was indeed crucified, but not in that nature, for which He is termed the Lord of Glory. In like manner, by the Son of Man the whole Person of Christ must necessarily be meant, who, being man upon earth, filled heaven with His glorious presence, but not according to that nature for which the title of man is given Him,"[1]

This interchange of titles is termed the "Communicatio Idiomatum," and by the Greeks ἀντίδοσις. It is only possible because the two natures are united in one Person, for it is only the *personal* titles, God and man, that can

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. v. ch. liii. § 4.

be thus interchanged. The abstract terms of nature, Godhead, and manhood, cannot be interchanged, because the natures remain distinct. It is true, then, to say that "God died for man," though the Godhead died not. If, however, Nestorianism were true, and if there were in Christ two persons, then it would be impossible to say that God died, or that the Jews "crucified the Lord of Glory."

But while the Church thus maintains, as against Nestorianism, the unity of person, she maintains also against Apollinarianism and Eutychianism that the two "whole and perfect natures" remain distinct, and that each retains its own essential properties. "Whatsoever is natural to deity the same remaineth in Christ uncommunicated to His manhood, and whatsoever is natural to manhood His deity thereof is incapable." The true properties and operations of His deity are summed up by Hooker under six heads:—(1) To know that which is not possible for created natures to comprehend; (2) To be simply the highest cause of all things, the well-spring of immortality and life; (3) To have neither end nor beginning of days; (4) To be everywhere present and enclosed nowhere; (5) To be subject to no alteration nor passion; (6) To produce of itself those effects which cannot proceed but from infinite majesty and power. To assert that any of these was communicated to Christ's manhood is practically to confuse the natures, to give to the finite nature that which belongs to the infinite, and so to destroy the *perfection* of the manhood, *i.e.* to fall into the error of Apollinaris or of Eutyches. Against such errors we may appeal to the witness of the Gospels, which set before us Christ's manhood as real and perfect, taken indeed by Him in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, "by the operation of the Holy Ghost," without the intervention of any human father, yet subject to those limitations which essentially belong to a finite

created nature. The evidence of Scripture for the birth from a virgin is clear and precise. Although popular language is freely used, so that Joseph and Mary are termed "His parents" (S. Luke ii. 27, 41), and "His father and His mother" (*ibid.* ver. 33), and even the blessed Virgin speaks to Him of Joseph as His "father" (*ibid.* ver. 48), yet both the Evangelists who record the nativity make it perfectly clear that it was from a *virgin* that He was born, without the intervention of any human father. The two accounts in S. Matthew and S. Luke are written from different points of view, the first evangelist giving us the narrative from Joseph's side, the third from the side of the mother; but they are capable of being easily harmonised, and there are strong grounds for thinking that S. Luke i. and ii. are based on an account which came from the blessed Virgin herself.[1] In the Epistles of S. Paul, it must be admitted that there is no *direct* reference to the birth from a Virgin, but not only is it "obviously unsafe to argue from S. Paul's silence, when he is equally silent on many other matters, which certainly formed part of the apostolic teaching," but also "there are portions of his teaching where the event may well have been in the background of his thoughts, as when he speaks of our Lord as "the heavenly man," insists on His absolute sinlessness, and describes Him as "made of a woman," in a context where it would have been at least as natural to represent Him as the son of Joseph had he believed Him to be such."[2]

[1] Reference may be permitted to an article on "The two Accounts of our Lord's Infancy" in the *Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. iii. p. 16.

[2] Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 54. Cf. also Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 274 *seq.* Dr. Swete fully proves (*op. cit.* p. 43 *seq.*) that the birth from a Virgin formed part of the belief of the Church from the very first, referring not only to Irenæus (i. x. 1) and Tertullian (*De Vel. Virg.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 2; *De Præscript.* 13), but also to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I. xxi. xxii. xxxii. xxxiii. lxiii.; *Dial.* xliii. xlviii. c.), Aristides, and Ignatius (*Eph.* 19, *Trall.* 9, *Smyrn.* 1).

That the humanity thus taken was real and complete is shown by numerous passages in the Gospels. He hungered and thirsted (S. Matt. xxi. 18; S. John xix. 28); He was weary (S. John iv. 6); He slept (S. Mark iv. 38); He was grieved (S. Mark iii. 5); He wept (S. Luke xix. 41; S. John xi. 35); He "increased in wisdom" as well as "in stature" (S. Luke ii. 52); His soul (ψυχή) was exceeding sorrowful even unto death (S. Matt. xxvi. 38); He "sighed deeply in His spirit" (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, S. Mark viii. 12); He "groaned in spirit" (S. John xi. 33); He was troubled in spirit (S. John xiii. 21); and at the moment of death He commended His spirit into the Father's hands (S. Luke xxiii. 46; cf. S. John xix. 30, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα). He, of whom such terms as these are used, must have possessed a true and proper human nature, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, nor can the properties of Deity have been transfered to that nature of which these expressions are used.

It is this union of the two whole and perfect natures in the one Person, which alone enables us to explain and do justice to all the features in the representation of Christ in the Gospel narratives. On the one hand, we have to account for the fact that He acts with powers far beyond those of ordinary men, and is endowed with knowledge far exceeding that of others. In His human body He was able to walk on the water. He could turn the water into wine, multiply the loaves and fishes so as to feed the hungry crowds that followed Him, heal the sick, give sight to the blind, cast out devils, and raise the dead. He saw Nathanael under the fig-tree (S. John i. 50), read the hearts of His disciples, and knew their thoughts before they were expressed (S. Matt. xvii. 25); "needed not that any should bear witness concerning man: for He Himself knew what was in man" (S. John ii. 25); He "knows the Father as the Father knows"

Him (S. John x. 15; cf. S. Matt. xi. 27). This is one side of the truth concerning the Person of Christ, as disclosed in the Gospel narrative. It is explained by the fact that though the essential properties of Deity are not communicable to man's nature, yet the supernatural gifts, graces, and effects thereof are,"[1] and by what Hooker calls "the gift of unction,"[2] as a consequence of the close union of the two natures in a single Personality, supernatural gifts and graces flowed in from the higher upon the lower nature united to it, infinitely ennobling and exalting it, but not in any way destroying its true and perfect *human* character, nor endowing it with the properties of Deity. Thus the body of Christ was a true human body, enabled by a divine gift to walk upon the water, but not able to be in two places at once, which would be contrary to the properties of human nature. The power of working miracles was, in the same way, a supernatural effect of Deity, as was also the enlightenment of the human soul with the knowledge of "what was in man." But there is another side as well to the portrait drawn in the Gospels, and from many passages we can see that, though for all purposes of His divine mission and work our Lord's manhood was thus supernaturally enlightened and endowed with divine powers, yet in ordinary matters, outside the sphere of the special work He had come to do, He accepted the limitations common to men in general, and natural to His position as born in a particular spot, at a particular time in the world's history. Though He miraculously

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. ch. liv.

[2] The expression is justified by S. Peter's words in Acts x. 38: "How God *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with Him." Cf. also S. Luke iv. 18. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath *anointed* me, etc."

fed the five thousand in the wilderness, yet when He was Himself an hungered, He was content to wait while His disciples went into the city to buy food to supply His needs (S. John iv. 8). In reference to His human intellect, it is said that He "increased in wisdom" (S. Luke ii. 52). Of the day and hour of the last judgment He Himself tells us that He did not know. "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father" (S. Mark xiii. 32). He raised the dead to life, but when His hour was come, Himself submitted to the power of death. Both classes of passages to which attention has been drawn refer to one and the same Person, and that Person the Eternal Son of God. That which explains them is the fact that in taking upon Him our nature He voluntarily limited Himself. In S. Paul's phrase, ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν (Phil. ii. 7), He "emptied Himself"—not of His Godhead, for that were an impossibility, but of the exercise of His divine prerogatives. He condescended "in all things to be made like unto His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17), sin only excepted (Heb. iv. 15; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 22).[1]

[1] Since peculiar difficulty is sometimes felt with regard to the question of the limitation of knowledge in the human soul of Christ, it may be well to add a brief note on the subject. *Infinite* knowledge, in the strictest sense of the word, can only belong to an infinite mind. It is, therefore, a "property" of the Godhead (cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. liii. § 1), and to say that the knowledge possessed by Christ's soul was infinite is practically to fall into the heresy of Apollinaris. Though, however, the finite human soul could not be possessed of infinite knowledge, yet, short of this, there is nothing of which we should be justified in saying that Christ "could not have known it." Each "piece of information" is finite, and, as a supernatural gift, not a property of the Godhead, might therefore have been communicated to the manhood. Had He so willed, He might have known it. Of one fact we have the express warrant of His own word for saying that He did not know it (S. Mark xiii. 32). What further limitations of knowledge there may have been beyond this can only be a matter of reasonable inference from the Gospel narrative.

III. *The Atonement.*

Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

Whatever they were, they were purely voluntary. If there were matters which He did not know, it was not because He could not have known them, but because He *condescended not to know.* Theologically, there is no greater difficulty in believing that He was ignorant of a hundred things than in believing that He was ignorant of *one.* If *one* fact was hidden from His human intellect we are forced to admit the co-existence of ignorance and infinite knowledge in a single Personality. But this, as the late Dr. Liddon has pointed out in his *Bampton Lectures*, is but one of the many contrasts which, in accepting the Incarnation at all, we are bound to admit ; nor is it really more mysterious than many "other and undisputed contrasts between the divine and human natures of the incarnate Son—*e.g.* the co-existence of local presence and omnipresence—of absolute blessedness, and intense suffering" (see Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 463). Dr. Liddon urges that we have no right to infer from St. Mark xiii. 32 ignorance on Christ's part on any other subject. It is true that we are never directly told of anything else that He did not know. But there are various expressions in the Gospels which appear to indicate that there were limitations of knowledge beyond this, and that on ordinary matters He willed to be dependent on ordinary means of information. He "increased in wisdom." Seeing the fig-tree with leaves—the usual sign of fruit—He came to it, "if haply He might find anything thereon" (S. Mark xi. 13). Again and again we read that He "marvelled" at something. Moreover, His questions, though doubtless often asked to "prove" His disciples, yet sometimes appear to have been called forth by a desire for information, *e.g.*, "Where have ye laid him?" (S. John xi. 34). "How many loaves have ye?" (S. Mark vi. 38, viii. 5). "How long time is it since this hath come unto him?" (S. Mark ix. 21). See further, Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. vi., and "An Inquiry into the Nature of our Lord's knowledge as Man," by W. S. Swayne. It may be added (in order to avoid misconception) that no argument can justly be drawn from limited knowledge to error or fallibility on the part of our blessed Lord, for, as the late Bishop Harold Browne pointed out, "Ignorance does not of necessity involve error. Of course in our present state of being, with our propensity to lean on our wisdom, ignorance is extremely likely to lead to error. But ignorance is not error ; and there is not one word in the Bible which could lead us to suppose that our blessed Lord was liable to error in any sense of the word, or in any department of knowledge."—*Pentateuch and Elohistic Psalms*, p. 13.

In the wording of this portion of the article four expressions are worthy of especial notice.—

1. "Who *truly* suffered."—So in Article IV. we read, "Christ did *truly* arise again from death." There is evidently a special emphasis upon the word "truly" in each case. And there can be no doubt that it was designedly added to guard against a Docetic view of the Incarnation, which had recently been revived by some among the Anabaptists. The heresy of the Docetæ (*Δοκηταί*) appeared in very early days. Its advocates maintained that our blessed Lord's body was like ours only in appearance, and not in reality. According to S. Jerome, "while the apostles were still surviving, while Christ's blood was still fresh, in Judæa, the Lord's body was asserted to be but a phantasm."[1] This view, which it is almost needless to say, contradicts the whole tenor of Scripture, was very prevalent among the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, many of whom denied altogether that Christ really took flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin,[2] and thus were led on to deny the *reality* of both His passion and His resurrection. Hence the insertion of the word "truly" here, and also in Article IV.

2. *To reconcile His Father to us.* — Exception is sometimes taken to this phrase, on the ground that it is unscriptural; for the Bible speaks of the need for men to be reconciled to God, but says nothing of God being reconciled to man. As far as the mere form of expression is concerned it must be admitted that the objection can be sustained. The following are

[1] *Adv. Lucif.* 23.

[2] See the Preface to Bishop Hooper's *Lesson of the Incarnation*, where it is noted that this "most pestilent and dangerous" doctrine has "gotten into the hearts of many."—*Later Writings of Bishop Hooper* (Parker Society), p. 3.

the only passages in the canonical books of Scripture in which the word "reconcile" occurs in this connection, and in none of them does the phrase used in the article occur.

Rom. v. 10, 11: For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God (*κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ*), through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled (*καταλλαγέντες*), shall we be saved by His life. And not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (*καταλλαγή*). 2 Cor. v. 18–20: "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself (*τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ*) through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation (*τῆς καταλλαγῆς*); to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors, therefore, on behalf of Christ, as though God were intreating by us: we beseech you, on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." Eph. ii. 16: "That He might reconcile them (*ἀποκαταλλάξῃ*) both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Col. i. 19–22: "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Him to reconcile (*ἀποκαταλλάξαι*) all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens. And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unreproveable before Him."

The Socinians, and those who with them object to the language of our article point to the form of expression

in all these passages, as indicating that the need for reconciliation was all on man's side, and hence they infer that there was no need for Christ "to reconcile His Father to us." The atonement revealed God's love, and so influenced men, but it had no "objective" value. Such an objection at first sight may appear to be plausible. But it is believed that a careful examination of the teaching of Scripture will show that it is quite untenable, and that the language of the article is perfectly justifiable. Though undoubtedly the *prominent* thought in all the passages quoted above is that of the removal of the enmity on man's part, yet the clause in 2 Cor. v. 19, "not reckoning unto them their trespasses," is sufficient to show that there is another aspect under which the atonement may be viewed. As Bengel excellently says, "καταλλαγή est δίπλευρος, et tollit (*a*) indignationem Dei adversus nos (2 Cor. v. 19; (*b*) nostramque abalienationem a Deo (2 Cor. v. 20)."[1] This is borne out by an examination of other passages in Scripture, in which the same word, καταλλάσσω (or the kindred διαλλάσσω) is used. The word merely means "the re-establishment of friendly relations between persons who have been at variance: on which side the antagonism exists is not to be determined by the word itself, or by its grammatical construction."[2] So in S. Matt. v. 24, our Lord says: "If thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." The brother, who has some cause of complaint, is, according to our idiom, the one who needs reconciliation. But our Lord puts it the

[1] Bengel on Rom. iii. 24.

[2] Dale on the *Atonement*, Note O, where see a careful discussion of the whole question. Cf. also Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. X. § 6.

other way. Not "first reconcile thy brother," but "first *be reconciled* to thy brother."[1]

But the real justification of the language of the article lies deeper than this. Even if the particular passages in which the word "reconcile" occurs could all be shown to refer entirely to the removal of man's alienation from God, yet that the atonement effected something which may truly be described as the reconciliation of God to man would seem to follow from those other passages in which the death of Christ is regarded as a "propitiation" and a sacrifice. Such passages are Rom. iii. 25: "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation (ἱλαστήριον) through faith, by His blood";[2] 1 John ii. 2: "He is the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins"; 1 John iv. 10: God "sent His Son to be the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins." Such language as this is amply sufficient to justify the phrase that is used in our article, for it clearly implies that God "changed His relation of antagonism to the world into a relation of friendship, by sending His Son 'to be the propitiation for our sins.' His own love for the world moved Him to do this; but until He did it there was antagonism, which, according to the apostolic thought, would have ultimately issued in 'wrath.'"[3]

3. "*Not only for original guilt, but also for all actual*

[1] Cf. also 1 Sam. xxix. 4 and 1 Cor. vii. 11. It is noteworthy that in the Second Book of Maccabees three times God is said *to be reconciled* (καταλλαγῆναι) to man (2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33, viii. 29; cf. v. 20, where the remarkable phrase "the reconciliation of the great Lord" occurs. ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλλαγή).

[2] "The Greek word properly means "that which renders propitious." Here "that which renders God propitious." In some way, which is not explained at all in this passage, and imperfectly explained elsewhere, the death of Christ did act so as to render God "propitious" towards men. He became more ready to pardon as they became more anxious to be pardoned."—Dr. Sanday in Bp. Ellicott's *New Testament for English Readers* (Note on Rom. iii. 25).

[3] Dale on the *Atonement, ubi supra.*

sins of men."—The careful specification of both "original guilt" and also "actual sins" is remarkable. We meet with it again in Article XXXI., where it is said that "the offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." It is accounted for by the fact that teachers were found within the Roman communion who, following the guidance of some among the schoolmen,[1] actually taught that, though Christ suffered on the cross for original sin, the sacrifice of the altar was daily offered for actual sin. The language of the article, as we have already seen, is drawn from the Confession of Augsburg, which directly mentions this terrible perversion of the truth in the following passage:—

"Accessit opinio, quæ auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus."[2]

4. "For *all* actual sins of men." — Attention is drawn to this assertion of the universality of redemption, because in various editions of the Articles the important word "all" has been, without the slightest authority, omitted, in order to force the article into agreement with the Calvinistic theory of "particular redemption," *i.e.* the doctrine that Christ died not for *all*, but only for "the elect." According to Hardwick, the

[1] Notably Albertus Magnus. "Secunda causa institutionis hujus sacramenti est sacrificium altaris, contra quandam quotidianam delictorum nostrorum rapinam. Ut sicut corpus Domini semel oblatum est in cruce pro debito originali: sic offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari et habeat in hoc ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum."—*De SS. Euch Sacr.* Serm. i.

[2] *Confessio August.* pt. ii. art. iii.

omission is found as early as 1630. It appears also in the article as revised by the Assembly of Divines in 1643, the whole clause being there rewritten in the interests of Calvinism, and standing as follows: "Who for our sakes truly *suffered most grievous torments in His soul from God*, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

The special phrases of the article which appear to require some explanation have now been noticed. But nothing has yet been said on the general subject of the atonement. The subject is too vast to receive anything like adequate treatment in the narrow limits within which it must be confined in such a work as this. All that can be attempted here is to give in briefest form a summary of the teaching of Scripture on the sacrifice of Christ; and in connection with it to suggest a few considerations which may be found helpful in removing the objections which are sometimes raised against the doctrine.

(*a*) That the article is only following the language of Scripture when it says that Christ suffered "to be a sacrifice" for sin, may be shown from numerous passages, such as the following:—

1 Cor. v. 7: "Our passover also hath been sacrificed (ἐτύθη), even Christ."

Eph. v. 2: "Walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice (προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν) to God for an odour of a sweet smell."

Heb. vii. 26, 27: "For such an high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily like those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his

own sins and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all, when He offered up Himself (*ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας*)."

Heb. ix. 26: "Now once at the end of the world hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (*διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ*)." Compare also Heb. x. 10 *seq.*, and the passages quoted above, concerning propitiation (Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10).

Again (*b*) the *vicarious* character of His suffering seems to be plainly implied in such passages as these:

S. Matt. xx. 28: "The Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*)."

S. John x. 11–18: See especially ver. 15, "I lay down my life for (*ὑπὲρ*) the sheep."

1 Tim. ii. 6: "Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all (*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*)."

See also 1 Pet. ii. 21–25, iii. 18 1 John iii. 16, and Rom. viii. 3, where the Revised Version renders *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* by the words "*as an offering* for sin."

Elsewhere we read of the Church as *purchased* with the blood of Christ (Acts xx. 28, *ἣν περιεποιήσατο*); of "redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*) through the blood" (Eph. i. 7 and 1 Pet. i. 18 (*ἐλυτρώθητε*).

(*c*) For the *universal* character of redemption and the fact that it was for *all* men that Christ died, appeal may be made to S. John iii. 16: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life." The breadth of such language is quite inconsistent with narrower theories that would limit the saving work of Christ to "the elect." So in 1 John ii. 2 we read "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world," while in the words of S. Paul quoted above we are expressly told that He gave himself a ransom for *all*" (1 Tim. ii. 6), as elsewhere the

same apostle states that He is "the Saviour of *all* men, especially of them that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10).[1]

Language such as that quoted under the two former heads (*a* and *b*) is surely incompatible with any theory that denies the objective value of the atonement. To maintain that the *whole* value of the death of Christ lies in its effect upon the minds and hearts of men by the supreme revelation which it makes of the love of God is to evacuate the words of Scripture of their plain meaning, and to introduce a method of interpretation which, if permitted, will enable men to evade the force of the clearest declarations. That grave difficulties can be raised with regard to the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice cannot be denied. But they are largely due, not to the doctrine itself as set forth in Scripture, but to the way in which it has been presented by divines.

It is a fact to which everyday experience bears witness that mediation is a law of this life, that repentance and amendment are of themselves often wholly insufficient to prevent the penal consequences of misconduct, and that vicarious suffering does contribute largely to the relief of others. The argument, as stated by Butler in the fifth chapter of the second part of the *Analogy* is unanswerable; and therefore to a theist, who accepts the order of nature and the existing constitution of things as coming from the hand of God, there will be no difficulty in admitting that the same method holds good in regard to man's salvation, which he finds to obtain in regard to his temporal welfare. Difficulties concerning *details* may fairly be raised; but to the *general principle* no exception can fairly be taken.

Nor must it be forgotten that while vicarious suffering in the natural order of things is often compulsory and involuntary, the sacrifice of Christ was purely voluntary.

[1] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 4.

He gave Himself, *Oblatus est quia ipse voluit.*[1] This does away altogether with any "injustice" as against the victim. There can be no injustice in laying on one that which He Himself wills to undertake. And, on the other hand, it must be carefully borne in mind that Holy Scripture is in no way responsible for those coarse and crude forms of presenting the doctrine, which give colour to the notion that it was an act of arbitrary substitution, the innocent suffering, and the guilty being let off scot-free. Throughout, Holy Scripture ever insists on the need of repentance on the part of the sinner, if he is to obtain the benefit of Christ's redemptive work. It teaches also that it was not merely "*a* man" who suffered. Had this been the case there might have been some ground for the notion that it was a purely arbitrary substitution of the innocent for the guilty. But the sufferer was "*the* man," the "Second Adam," the Head and Representative of the whole race, for which He is thereby qualified to become the sponsor (ἔγγυος). In the words of S. Irenæus: "As a man caused the fall, so a man must cause the restoration. He must be a man able to *sum up* (*recapitulare*) all the human species in Himself, so as to bear the punishment of all, and to render an obedience that will compensate for their innumerable acts of disobedience."[2]

[1] Isa. liii. 7, in the Vulgate. As a *translation* the words cannot be defended, but they give grand expression to a truth of Scripture.

[2] Irenæus, v. i. 1; cf. Norris, *Rudiments of Theology*, p. 59: "When the mystery of the Redeemer's Person is borne in mind, it almost ceases to be a mystery that His death should affect the whole human race. Every act of Christ *must* vibrate through humanity! If, in a plant, an injury to the root is felt in every branch; if in an army, it is not the captain only who conquers or is conquered, but every soldier with him; if in all organic societies, when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if in the great family of mankind, the fall of one entailed the fall of all—then is it a strange thing that S. Paul thus judged, that if Christ died for all, then all died in Him?" See also Wilberforce on the *Incarnation*, ch. ii.

Again, objections of another kind, which are frequently raised, are only valid against an entire perversion of the scriptural doctrine. The atonement has sometimes been represented as if it involved a discordance of will between the First and Second Persons of the blessed Trinity. Christian preachers have not always been careful in their language, and their teaching has sometimes given countenance to the idea that the Father was vengeful and longing to punish, while the Son was all mercy and tenderness; whereas Holy Scripture consistently represents the atonement as an act of love on the part of the *Father* equally with the Son. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life" (S. John iii. 16). God "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all" (Rom. viii. 32). And while we read of the "wrath" of God, we read also of "the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. vi. 16).

These considerations may prove helpful in meeting some of the most obvious objections which are brought against the doctrine. It may not be possible out of the various notices of the atonement in Scripture to form a complete and consistent theory that shall be entirely free from all difficulty. Nor is it necessary that the attempt to form such a theory should be made. From time to time various "schemes" have been advanced, and explanations offered which have been more or less widely accepted by divines. But none of them can claim the formal sanction of the Church as a whole. That which perhaps has been the most widely held of all is the patristic theory that by the fall Satan gained a "right" over man, and that man could therefore only be released by a satisfaction of Satan's just claim. According to this view the death of Christ was regarded as the "price" or "ransom" paid to Satan to satisfy his claim. It has

been said that S. Irenæus was the first to suggest this view, which is further developed by Origen, and that it is the common explanation of the necessity for the death of Christ, which prevailed for nearly a thousand years in the Church, till the days of S. Anselm, in whose work *Cur Deus Homo*, it is for the first time expressly and unreservedly rejected.[1] There is, perhaps, some exaggeration in this statement,[2] but there can be no doubt that at one time the theory was very widely held. It rests, however, on an entire misunderstanding of the scriptural use of such figurative expressions as "ransom" and "purchase." It is quite certain from numerous passages in the Old Testament that to the Jew these terms would never have suggested the question "To *whom* was the the ransom paid?" as they suggested it in later days to Greek and Latin writers. The great event in their national history, which fixed for the Jews once for all their conception of redemption or ransom, was the exodus from Egypt. Then it was that God *redeemed* His people, delivered them from the house of bondage, *purchased* them, *ransomed* them. All these terms are freely used in Holy Scripture of the event. So in the Song of Moses we read:

"Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth Thy people whom Thou hast redeemed גָּאָלְתָּ; LXX., ἐλυτρώσω. . . . All the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away. Fear and dread shall fall upon them; by the greatness of Thine arm they shall be still as a stone; till Thy people pass over, O Lord; till the people pass over which Thou hast purchased, קָנִיתָ; LXX., ἐκτήσω (Ex. xv. 13–16).[3]

[1] See Oxenham's *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 126, and cf. p 167.

[2] See Norris's *Rudiments of Theology*, p. 274 *seq.*

[3] In the LXX. λυτρόω occurs about seventy times of God's *redemption* of His people collectively or individually, occurring first in Ex. vi. 6. "I will *redeem* you with a stretched-out arm"; and representing the two Hebrew words גָּאַל and פָּדָה. Κτάομαι is of much rarer occurrence. Besides

This was the deliverance which fixed decisively the idea of redemption. God redeemed, ransomed, purchased His people; but there was nothing paid to Pharaoh or to the Egyptian taskmaster. Any thought of a sum of money or ransom, received by the power from which the captive is delivered, is wholly absent from the Old Testament conception of redemption. "It cannot be said," writes Bishop Westcott, "that God paid to the Egyptian oppressor any price for the redemption of His people. On the other hand, the idea of the exertion of a mighty force, the idea that the redemption *costs* much is everywhere present."[1] Though there was no compensation of any kind paid to the Egyptian bondmaster there was clearly the interposition of something as a condition of deliverance—the people were *redeemed.* Thus, when we remember how, all through the Old Testament, this great act of deliverance is spoken of as God's redemption or ransom of His people, we see at once that writers of the New Testament would naturally use similar language of its "perfect spiritual Antitype," the great act of deliverance from Satan's bondage which they connected with the cross of Jesus Christ; and that they would speak of the Church as redeemed or ransomed, by the precious blood of Christ, without any thought occurring to them of the question which disturbed men's minds in later times, to whom was the ransom paid—a question which has only arisen from a misconception, and from bringing in to the interpretation of Holy Scripture ideas which are totally foreign to it.

We shall be right, then, if we dismiss from our minds once for all the notion of a ransom paid to Satan. Nor need we shrink from resting content without attempting

Ex. xv. 16 (where Codex A has ἐλυτρώσω) it is used of God in Ps. lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 2, and lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 54 = נָאַל.

[1] On the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 296.

to construct a complete theory of the atonement. The subject is best left where Scripture leaves it. While, on the one hand, we refuse to explain it away, or to do violence to the passages quoted above which attribute an atoning value to the suffering of Christ, and regard it as a "sacrifice" and "propitiation," on the other hand we may well decline to speculate too closely on the precise manner in which it was efficacious. The fact that it *was* efficacious is clearly taught in Scripture, and that is enough for us. The conclusion which forced itself on the mind of Bishop Butler in the eighteenth century is one which we shall do well to make our own.

"How and in what particular way it had this efficacy, there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain, but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it. . . . And if the Scripture has, as surely it has, left this matter of the satisfaction of Christ mysterious, left somewhat in it unrevealed, all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, yet at least uncertain. Nor has anyone reason to complain for want of farther information, unless he can show his claim to it.

"Some have endeavoured to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, beyond what the Scripture has authorised; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away, and confining His office as Redeemer of the world to His instruction, example, and government of the Church. Whereas the doctrine of the gospel appears to be, not only that He taught the efficacy of repentance, but rendered it of the efficacy which it is by what He did and suffered for us; that He obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life; not only that He revealed to sinners that they were in a capacity of salvation, and how they might obtain it, but,

moreover, that He put them into this capacity of salvation by what He did and suffered for them, put us into a capacity of escaping future punishment and obtaining future happiness. And it is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit, by performing the conditions upon which it is offered on our part, without disputing how it was procured on His."[1]

[1] *Analogy*, pt. ii. ch. v.

ARTICLE III

De descensu Christi ad inferos.

Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.

Of the going down of Christ into hell.

As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell.

In the Confession of Augsburg there was merely a single clause on the descent into hell in the article, *De Filio Dei*, "Item, descendit ad inferos." Our own article, as it now stands, is considerably shorter than the corresponding one in the series of 1553. As originally drawn up by Cranmer it went more fully into the explanation of what was meant by the descent into hell, and contained these words: "Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit, quemadmodem testatur Petri locus. At suo ad inferos descensu nullos a carceribus aut tormentis liberavit Christus Dominus." In this form the article was signed by the six royal chaplains, but prior to publication the last clause (At suo . . . Dominus) was omitted, and the article, as published in 1553, stands in the English copy as follows:—

"As Christ died, and was buried for us: so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell. For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection: but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify."

At the revision in Elizabeth's reign the bishops in Convocation struck out the last clause which refers to St. Peter's language,[1] and the article was thus brought into its present form, in which it simply states the *fact* of the descent, but attempts no explanation of it, and brings forward no scriptural proof of it. The reason for the alteration is probably to be sought for in the controversies which were agitating the country at the time. The subject is one which has always had a special attraction for many minds, and in the sixteenth century there were many and various theories held concerning it; and the violent controversies which had been raised in some parts of the country are quite sufficient to account for the excision of the allusion to S. Peter's language. The following extract from a paper of Bishop Alley of Exeter, drawn up in preparation for the Convocation of 1553, admirably illustrates the wisdom of the Elizabethan divines in their treatment of this article:

"First, for matters of Scripture, namely, for this place which is written in the Epistle of S. Peter, that *Christ in Spirit went down to Hell, and preached to the souls that were in Prison.* There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers, one against the other, and also partakers with them; some holding that the going down of Christ, His soul to Hell, was nothing else but the virtue and strength of Christ, His death, to be made manifest and known to them that were dead before. Others say that *Descendit ad inferna* is nothing else but that Christ did sustain upon the

[1] The clause was untouched by Parker in his preliminary revision, and is therefore found in the MS. which the archbishop submitted to the bishops (now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). It is, however, marked in this for excision, a line being drawn through it with the archbishop's red pencil.

cross the infernal pains of hell, when He called *Pater, quare me dereliquisti*, i.e. *Father, why hast Thou forsaken me?* Finally, others preach that this article is not contained in other symbols, neither in the symbol of *Cyprian*, or rather *Rufine*. And all these sayings they ground upon *Erasmus* and the *Germans*, and especially upon the authority of Mr. *Calvin* and Mr. *Bullinger*. The contrary side bring for them the universal consent, and all the Fathers of both churches, both of the *Greeks* and the *Latines*. For of the *Latine* Fathers, they bring in *S. Austin*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Jerom*, *Gregory* the Great, *Cassiodore*, *Sedulius*, *Virgilius*, *Primasius*, *Leo*, with others, as it may appear in the places by them alledged. Of the *Greek* Fathers, they alledge *Chrysostom*, *Eusebius*, *Emissenus*, *Damascen*, *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Epiphanius*, *Athanasius*, with others. Which all, both *Latines* and *Grecians*, do plainly affirm, *Quod anima Christi fuit vere per se in inferno, i.e.* that the soul of Christ was truly of itself in hell; which they all with one universal consent have assertively written from time to time, by the space of 1100 years, not one of them varying from another.

"Thus, my Right Honourable good Lords, your wisdoms may perceive what tragedies and dissensions may arise for consenting to, or dissenting from this article. Wherefore, your grave, wise, and godly learning might do well and charitably, to set some certainty concerning this doctrine; and chiefly because all dissensions, contentions, and strifes may be removed from the godly affected preachers." [1]

[1] Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. p. 348. At an earlier date the subject was causing trouble, for in May 1550 Micronius writes to Bullinger, and tells him that "they are disputing about the descent of Christ into hell" (*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 561). It is also worth noticing that among Parker's books there exists a volume with the following title, *A Treatise concerning the immediate Going to Heaven of the souls of the faithful*

We shall probably not be far wrong if we attribute to this appeal from the Bishop of Exeter the alteration introduced into the article.[1]

Three subjects require to be considered in connection with this article.

1. The meaning of the word Hell.

fathers before Christ; and that Christ did not descend into Hell, by Christopher Carlile. Appended to this is a memorandum: "This book exhibited and delivered the 20th day of August 1563, to the most Reverend Father in God, the Lord Matthu, Archbishop of Cant., by me, Thomas Tailor, etc. . . . the doctrine whereof I neither allow nor approve." See Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ix. p. 510.

Was the dispute, referred to by Micronius, caused by Bishop Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*, which was published in the year 1550? The following extraordinary passage may well have given rise to any amount of discussion:—"I believe also that while He was upon the said cross dying, and giving up His spirit unto God His Father, He descended into hell; that is to say, He did verily taste and feel the great distress and heaviness of death, and likewise the pains and torments of hell, that is to say, the great wrath and severe judgment of God upon Him, even as if God had utterly forsaken Him, yea, as though God had been His extreme enemy; so that He was constrained with loud voice to cry, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' This is simply my understanding of Christ, His descending into hell. And besides, I know well that this article hath not from the beginning been in the creed, and that many others have otherwise both understanded and interpreted it; which esteem that Christ verily and indeed descended into hell, to the place of the damned, alleging the text of S. Peter; the which I confess is yet covered and hid from me. The Lord vouchsafe to open the gate unto us, and to give us an entrance into such mysteries." —*Later Writings* of Bishop Hooper (P.S.), p. 30.

[1] Even so the article remained a subject of bitter controversy in some quarters. See Strype's *Parker*, bk. iii. ch. xviii., where there is a notice of a controversy which arose at Cambridge in 1567, "what the true sense of Christ's descent into hell was; whether it were a local descent, as it was then commonly taken, or to be understood in some other meaning. This dispute was managed with so much heat, that it came to the secretary, who was that universities' Chancellor. And he sent unto the archbishop for his advice in this matter; who gave him his thoughts for the better stilling, and composing this difference. But what that was, I find not."

2. The scriptural grounds for the doctrine, and the object of the descent.

3. The history of the doctrine in the Church and of the clause in the creed referring to it.

I. *The Meaning of the word Hell.*

The word used in the Latin of the article is *Inferi*, which is also used in the Athanasian Creed, and in most of the later copies of the Apostles' Creed. The older ones usually have *Inferna*,[1] a few the singular *Infernum*.[2] The difference in meaning is but slight. If the distinction of genders is to be pressed, we should have to say that while the neuter referred only to the *place*, the masculine was suggestive of the *persons* to whom He descended; and we actually find that in an Anglo-Saxon Psalter the clause is rendered, "He nither astah to hel-warum"[3]—*i.e.* to the inhabitants of hell. But it is not clear that any such distinction is intended to be drawn, for the words *Inferi*, *Infernus*, and *Inferna* are apparently used indiscriminately in the Vulgate, as the equivalents of the Hebrew Sheol (שְׁאוֹל) and the Greek Hades (Ἅιδης), while they are never used to represent Gehenna or the place of torment. In order, therefore, to see the meaning of the word Hell in this article, it is necessary to examine the belief of the Hebrews concerning the invisible world. Sheol occurs more than sixty times in the Old Testament, being in almost every instance rendered in the LXX. by Ἅιδης. The word itself is a "neutral" word,[4] meaning the under-world or state of the departed in general—the "meeting-place for

[1] So the Creed of Aquileia as given by Rufinus. There is some evidence that this was also the original reading in the Athanasian Creed.

[2] The singular is found in the Creed of Venantius Fortunatus.

[3] Lambeth Library, No. 427, of the ninth century.

[4] The word שְׁאוֹל is softened from שׁאל, a root meaning to be hollow.

all living (Job xxx. 23), where were the souls of the righteous, Jacob (Gen. xxxvii. 35), Samuel (1 Sam. xxviii. 15),[1] David (2 Sam. xii. 23), as well as tyrants such as the King of Babylon (Isa. xiii. 9). In course of time, as Jewish belief developed, and the hope of a future life became clearer, it was recognised that there was a difference in the condition of the souls of the departed in the under-world, though there are but the faintest traces of this in the canonical books of the Old Testament. Our "main pre-Christian authority" for the belief of the Jews, shortly before the days of our Lord's ministry, is the Book of Enoch, dating from the first and second centuries, B.C. In this we read of a vision shown to Enoch by an angel, who showed him "beautiful places intended for this, that upon these may be assembled the spirits, the souls of the dead."[2] These are the resting-places of the souls of the just, and elsewhere we read of a Garden of Righteousness and Garden of Life,[3] which "appears to be the prototype of what was afterwards known as the Garden of Eden, or Paradise," though its "relation to the abodes just described is not distinctly indicated."[4] Enoch is also shown other places not far from the abodes of the righteous, where the souls of the wicked are separated in great affliction until the great day of judgment.[5] While later on he is granted a vision of a "cursed valley" which "is for those who will be cursed to eternity,"[6] namely, the valley of Hinnom, better known in this connection in the Græcised form of the word, Gehenna (= גֵּי הִנֹּם).[7]

[1] שְׁאוֹל is not actually mentioned in this passage, but Josephus definitely speaks of "Αιδης as the place from which the soul of Samuel was evoked. —*Antiq.* VI. xiv. § 2.

[2] Book of Enoch, ch. xxii. [3] Ch. xxxii. lx. lxi. lxxvii.

[4] Driver's *Sermons on the Old Testament*, p. 79.

[5] Ch. xxii. [6] Ch. xxvii.

[7] גֵּיהִנּוֹם is used frequently in the Targums and the Talmud, *e.g.* Pirqe

Sheol, then, according to the belief of the Jews, is the place where the souls of the departed await their final judgment, and is divided into two parts, in one of which are the souls of the faithful in peace and rest, in the other the souls of sinners, already in torment, though apparently not yet in Gehenna. And this is the belief which seems to have the direct sanction of the New Testament. Thus our Lord promises to the penitent thief that he shall be with Him "to-day in Paradise" (= the garden of Eden, S. Luke xxiii. 43); and in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Lazarus is carried by the angels to "Abraham's bosom," seemingly another name for Paradise,[1] while Dives is described as being "in Hades," and "in torments" (S. Luke xvi. 22, 23). To Sheol or Hades, then, the English word Hell[2] in this article corresponds, and like the Hebrew word it is a "neutral" term, in itself conveying no notion of the condition of the spirits detained in it, whether it be one of blessedness or the reverse. Both the Greek and Latin terms, Hades and Inferi, are entirely free from the associations which have unfortunately grown up round our English word Hell, owing to the unfortunate accident that it has been adopted as the translation for Gehenna[3]

Aboth v. 29, where גֵּיהִנֹּם also occurs. See Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, div. ii. vol. ii. p. 183.

[1] See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on S. Luke xvi., where instances are quoted of the use of this term by Jewish writers.

[2] Hell comes from the Anglo-Saxon *Helan* (German, *Hüllen*), to cover. It is, therefore, the unseen and covered place. "It is properly used both in the Old and New Testament to render the Hebrew word in the one and the Greek word in the other, which describe the invisible mansions of the disembodied souls, without any reference to sufferings."—Bishop Horsley's *Works*, vol. ii. Serm. 20.

[3] Hell is in the Authorised Version used as the translation of γέεννα in S. Matt. v. 22, 29, 30, x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33, S. Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; S. Luke xii. 5; S. James iii. 6. It represents Ἅιδης in S. Matt. xi. 23, xvi. 18; S. Luke x. 15, xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 55; Rev. i. 18, iii. 7, vi. 8, xx. 13, 14.

as well as Hades, and thus denotes definitely the place of torments, as well as the intermediate state.

II. *The Scriptural Grounds for the Doctrine and the Object of the Descent.*

The passages of Scripture which require to be considered in connection with the subject of our Lord's descent into hell are four in number: (*a*) St. Luke xxiii. 43; (*b*) Acts ii. 24–31, including the quotation of Ps. xvi. 10; (*c*) Eph. iv. 9; and (*d*) 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6.

(*a*) St. Luke xxiii. 43. This verse gives us our Lord's promise to the penitent thief, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise." The words assume and sanction the current belief that Paradise, or the Garden of Eden, was the part of that unseen region to which the name of Sheol was given, in which the souls of the faithful departed were preserved. And thus the passage appeals to us with the weight of a direct statement from our Lord Himself that after His death He would pass into the region of departed souls, *i.e.* would "descend into hell."

It would seem, then, that on scriptural grounds, and apart from all historical considerations, we are justified in referring to these words in connection with the descent into hell. But it does not appear that they were ever appealed to by the Fathers as proof or illustration of the fact of the descent, and those who first inserted the article into the creed can hardly be supposed to have had in view the promise to the penitent thief. Although it would seem that Jewish belief inclined to the inclusion of Paradise in Sheol, or Hades, yet some of the Christian Fathers, as Tertullian,[1] expressly distinguish between the

[1] Tertullian (*De Anima*, 55) mentions a treatise that he had written, *De Paradiso*, in which he says that he had proved "omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini." He carefully distinguishes between

two; and the general opinion among them, to which the article in the creed must have been intended to give expression, most certainly was that Christ descended into some region which they never speak of as Paradise, where were the souls of the faithful who had died under the Old Covenant, that He announced to them the accomplishment of His work of redemption, and then transferred them to Paradise. Something more will have to be said on this subject later on. For the present we pass on to the consideration of the next passage of Scripture alleged as proof of the doctrine.

(*b*) Acts ii. 24–31. In these verses S. Peter quotes and applies the language of David in Psalm xvi.: "I beheld the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope: because Thou wilt not

Paradise and Inferi, holding that the martyrs, and they alone, go direct to Paradise. All others, including the souls of the faithful generally, are *apud inferos*. But this region is divided into two parts, "Sinus Abrahæ" (which is thus distinguished from Paradise), and the place assigned to the wicked. The patriarchs and prophets were *apud inferos*, and to them Christ descended to make them *compotes sui*. Cf. *Adv. Marcion*. iv. 34. In *Apol.* 47, Paradise is the place of heavenly bliss, appointed to receive the spirits of the saints, apparently after the last judgment. Irenæus (V. xxxi.) has much about the "place where the souls of the dead were," the "invisible place allotted by God," where souls "remain till the resurrection," but nowhere identifies it with Paradise. According to Origen there is an upper and a lower Paradise. To the lower one (=Abraham's bosom) go the souls of the righteous, and thither Christ transferred the souls of the patriarchs and prophets. See hom. in Num. xxvi. 4, and hom. ii. in 1 Reg. In Augustine, *De Genesi ad Literam*, bk. xii. ch. xxxiii, the reader will find a very interesting discussion of the meaning of the terms Inferi, Sinus Abrahæ, and Paradise. Augustine admits that the place where the souls of the just are is sometimes called Inferi, but points out that Lazarus is not said to be *apud inferos*, whereas Dives is. Cf. also *Ep. ad Dardanum*, clxxxvii., where Augustine admits that the explanation of our Lord's saying to the penitent thief, which refers it to the descent into hell, is a possible one, though, as he thinks, involving considerable difficulties.

leave my soul in Hades (εἰς ᾅδην), neither wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou madest known unto me the ways of life; Thou shalt make me full of gladness with Thy countenance." These words, the apostle proceeds to show, received no adequate fulfilment in the person of David. They could not, therefore, find their ultimate realisation in his experience. "He both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day." They look forward beyond the life and death of the patriarch, and find their complete realisation in the person of the Messiah. David, "being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins He would set one upon his throne, he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was He left in Hades (εἰς ᾅδην) nor did His flesh see corruption." The witness of this passage to the *fact* of the descent is equally clear with that of the one previously cited, though it says nothing of the *object* of the descent, or of the nature of the region visited.

(*c*) Eph. iv. 9: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth (εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς, Vulg. *in inferiores partes terræ*)? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things."

This passage cannot be appealed to without some hesitation, for the interpretation of it is not absolutely certain. Two different views have been taken of its meaning. *First*, that which takes it of the descent into hell; a view which finds large support among both ancient and modern commentators, and which can claim in its favour the use of the term τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς in the LXX. rendering of Psalm lxii. (lxiii) 10, and of the kindred phrase ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτω (κατωτάτοις, ℵ ART) τῆς

γῆς in cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 15. Indeed, as Bishop Pearson says, "This exposition must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it." But though it is the most probable, yet it is not the only possible interpretation of the apostle's words; for, *secondly*, they may be taken as contrasting the *earth beneath* with the *heaven above*, and thus allude not to the *descensus in inferna*, but simply to the fact of the Incarnation, when Christ "came down" or "descended into" the earth beneath.[1]

(*d*) The last passage to be considered brings us face to face with the whole question of the *object* of the descent. Were it not for the language of S. Peter in his First Epistle (1 Pet. iii. 18–iv. 6) there would be no grounds for looking for any further object of the descent into hell than this: that Christ might fulfil the conditions of *death* as really and truly as of *life*. If Hell or Hades merely means the unseen world of departed spirits, then death in the case of every human being, consisting as it does of the separation of the soul and body, *ipso facto* involves a "descent into hell" on the part of everyone who is subject to it. If, then, our Lord really died upon the cross, it was a necessity that His human soul should pass into the world of spirits, and "descend into hell." "Christ in dying shared to the full our lot. His body was laid in the tomb. His soul passed into that state on which we conceive that our souls shall enter. He has won for God, and hallowed every condition of human existence. We cannot be where He has not been. He bore our nature as living: he bore our nature as dead."[2] This, then, namely, to fulfil the conditions of death, may

[1] For a full discussion of this passage see the Commentaries of Meyer and Ellicott, *in loc.* Both these writers decide in favour of its reference to the descent into hell.

[2] Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 76.

unhesitatingly be set down as one object of the descent. It remains to consider whether the language of S. Peter compels us to maintain that there was a yet further object of it, namely, the preaching of the gospel to them who were sometime disobedient.

1 Pet. iii. 18 *seq.*: "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit (*θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*): in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison (*ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν*), which aforetime were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. . . . [ch. iv. 6] For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit (*εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ, ζῶσὶ δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι*)."

It has been already mentioned that the direct reference to this passage was struck out of the article in its passage through Convocation in 1563, owing to the controversies which were then agitating the country. But although there was manifested an unwillingness to bind a particular interpretation of what is confessedly a very difficult passage upon the consciences of the clergy, yet the judgment of the English Church as to the meaning of S. Peter's words is not obscurely indicated by the retention of the passage as the epistle for Easter Eve, an occasion for which it is obviously appropriate only if it be taken as referring to the descent into hell.

In the early Church it would appear that there was no doubt whatever concerning the reference of the apostle's words. The first writer who directly connects the passage with the descent is believed to be Clement of

Alexandria. In this he is followed by Origen.[1] Nor is there a trace of any other interpretation till the days of Augustine. He, however, in a letter to Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, enters fully into the exegesis of the words, and concludes his discussion by deciding that they have nothing whatever to do with the descent into hell, but refer to the teaching of Christ—in the spirit not in the flesh—to the unbelieving in the days of Noah.[2] Augustine's authority was naturally of great weight in the Western Church. His view on this subject is adopted by Bede, by S. Thomas Aquinas,[3] and, as might be expected, found favour with many of the Reformers; and it must be admitted that "the dominant exegesis of 1 Pet. iii. 19, among the English theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has been that which disconnects it altogether from the descent into Hades.[4]

In spite, however, of this, there is little doubt that Augustine and those who followed his lead in this matter are wrong. They have often failed to see clearly the distinction between Hades and Gehenna, and have sometimes been misled by the erroneous reading, *τῷ πνεύματι*, as, for instance, was Bishop Pearson, who interprets the clause not of the human soul of Christ, but of the power of His Divinity; an explanation which can hardly be maintained when the definite article is deleted, for the phrase *θανατωθεὶς μέν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι* can point

[1] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, VI. vi.; *Origen, In Matt.* 132.

[2] The whole letter (No. clxiv.) is worth careful study. "The spirits in prison" are explained by Augustine as "souls which were at the time still in the bodies of men, and which being shut up in the darkness of ignorance were, so to speak, 'in prison'—a prison such as that from which the Psalmist sought deliverance in the prayer, 'Bring my soul out of prison that I may praise Thy name.'"

[3] *Summa*, 3*a* Q. 52, 2, 3*m*.

[4] Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 97.

to nothing but the contrast between flesh and spirit,[1] or (as the terms are popularly used) body and soul. Taking the words of the apostle, then, as they stand, it would appear that they speak directly of what happened after the death of Christ. "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened (*i.e.* endowed with a new power of life) in the spirit" He "went and preached to the spirits in prison." The spirits to whom the announcement was made are further described as those "which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." If the interpretation here given be correct, these words definitely teach us that *the* or at any rate *an* object of the descent was the proclamation of the gospel to that generation which had been cut off by the flood. Two questions immediately present themselves: (1) What was the effect of the preaching, *i.e.* did it bring about any alteration in the condition of those to whom it was made? and (2) Was it confined to the generation actually specified by S. Peter, or were its benefits (if any) extended to others also?

1. With regard to the first of these questions, it has been pointed out that the word used by the apostle is ἐκήρυξε, proclaimed as a herald. Hence it has been inferred that the preaching was "a mere proclamation of blessedness to men who had already repented when on earth, and had no need of repentance after death; when it never comes, and could not avail even if it did come."[2] This view is unsatisfactory for two reasons—*first*, the words of Scripture cannot be said to imply that the recipients of the preaching had "already repented when on earth." S. Peter speaks of them as having been "aforetime disobedient," but says not one word of any

[1] Cf. Rom. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

[2] Bishop Browne on *The Articles*, p. 96.

subsequent repentance; *secondly*, 1 Pet. iii. 19 does not stand alone. It cannot be fairly isolated or considered apart from ch. iv. 6, which speaks of the gospel being preached—using the word *εὐαγγελίζειν not κηρύσσειν*—to the dead (*νεκροῖς*), and states further the object of the preaching: "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.[1] These words are admittedly difficult, but they certainly seem to imply that the preaching was attended with some beneficial result. On the whole, the best interpretation of them appears to be that which takes the first clause immediately following *ἵνα* (that they might be judged, etc.) as a subordinate one, of the state which the *εὐηγγελίσθη* left remaining, and thus makes the last words "that they might live, etc.," as the true result and end of the preaching.[2] But whatever be the details of interpretation, the passage as a whole is surely a sufficient warrant for holding (*a*) that there was a *second* object of the descent into hell, namely, to preach to the spirits in prison; and (*b*) that this preaching of the gospel to the dead was in some way instrumental in changing their condition for the better.

If this view be correct it follows that the descent into hell should be regarded not only as the *last* step in the humiliation of Christ, but also as the first step in His triumph. It witnessed the initial fulfilment of that acknowledgment of Him, of which S. Paul speaks in Phil. ii. 10, "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth (*καταχθονίων*), and that every tongue

[1] It is remarkable that neither Horsley in his celebrated sermon on 1 Pet. iii. 19 (*Works*, vol. ii. Serm. 20) nor Bishop Browne (*On the Thirty-Nine Articles*) makes the slightest allusion to this text.

[2] Cf. Alford, *in loc.*; the construction may be illustrated by Rom. vi. 17, viii. 10.

should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," where it should be noticed that the word used for "things under the earth" is rendered in the Vulgate, Inferna, which, as we have already seen, is one of the terms most frequently employed to describe the place to which Christ "descended" after His death.

2. The second question, Was the preaching confined to the generation specified by S. Peter, or were its benefits extended to others as well, is one to which it is perhaps impossible to return a definite and certain answer. One generation, and one generation alone, is specified by the apostle; and that just the generation of which it might be said that it received exceptional treatment on earth. It may, therefore, have been the subject of a special extension of mercy in the unseen world of Hades. But, as will be shown immediately, there is an extraordinarily strong tradition among the Fathers that Christ descended to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Dispensation, and preached to them, and bettered their condition. There is no other passage of Holy Scripture from which such a tradition can have originated; and it would therefore seem that the Fathers took it that those mentioned by S. Peter were but specimens, so to speak, of a class—of those, that is, who had lived and died under the Old Covenant. It *may* be so. But this is all that can be said. Where Scripture is silent, such an inference must be more or less precarious, and though the opinion may appear a probable one, it can only be held (if at all) as a "pious opinion," which cannot be pressed upon any as a part of the faith. In any case, it would be rash in the extreme to infer from this passage the possibility of an extension of the day of grace, or an opportunity of repentance beyond the grave, for Christians, whose case is wholly different. It cannot be said that the apostle's words afford the slightest grounds for

expecting a second offer of salvation to any of those who have slighted or misused God's revelation made "in His Son."

III. *The History of the Doctrine in the Church, and of the clause in the Creed referring to it.*

Although the clause "He descended into hell," has never formed part of the creed of the Eastern Church, and only made its way into that of the West in comparatively late times, it is remarkable how prominent a position the fact of the descent occupied in the belief of the early Christians, and how very general was the belief that it was instrumental in changing for the better the condition of the faithful who had died before the coming of Christ. It meets us from the very first. Ignatius (A.D. 115), in his *Epistle to the Magnesians*, speaks of it: "Even the prophets, being His disciples, were expecting Him as their teacher, through the Spirit. And for this cause He, whom they rightly awaited, when He came, raised them from the dead."[1] Justin Martyr (140) and Irenæus (180) both quote the following passage as from Jeremiah or Isaiah, and apply it to the descent into hell: "The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and descended to preach to them His own salvation."[2] Irenæus also quotes a certain presbyter "who had heard it from those who had seen the apostles and from those who had been their disciples,"

[1] Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* ch. ix.

[2] Justin Martyr's *Dial. with Trypho*, ch. lxxii. Justin Martyr here (probably without sufficient justification) accuses the Jews of having cut out the passage from the sayings of Jeremiah. There is no trace of any such words in existing copies of the LXX. Irenæus says nothing of any such charge against the Jews, but cites the passage several times; in III. xxii. as from Isaiah, in IV. xxxvi. as from Jeremiah, and in IV. lv., without giving the name of the author.

as having said that the Lord "descended in *ea quæ sunt sub terra*, preaching His advent there also, and declaring remission of sins received by those who believe in Him. But all those believed in Him, whose hope was set on Him—that is, who foretold His advent and submitted to His dispensations, just men and prophets and patriarchs, etc."[1] Similarly, Tertullian (200) says that Christ "in Hades (*apud inferos*) underwent the law of human death, nor did He ascend to the heights of heaven, until He descended to the lower parts of the earth (*in inferiora terrarum*) that there He might make patriarchs and prophets sharers of His life (*compotes sui*)."[2] To a still earlier date, perhaps,[3] belongs the recently discovered fragment of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, which refers to the descent into hell in the following words:— "They see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven; but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Thou didst preach (ἐκήρυξας) to them that sleep; and a response was heard from the cross, yea." It would be easy to multiply quotations from later Fathers. References to some of them are appended in a note.[4] But those just

[1] Irenæus, IV. xlii.

[2] *De Anima*, ch. 55.

[3] "About A.D. 165." See Swete, *Gospel of Peter*, p. xliv. The passage quoted in the text occurs in ch. ix.

[4] The descent into hell is a prominent feature in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, which perhaps dates from the second century (ch. xxxi.–xviv.). The doctrine was accepted by the heretic Marcion (see Irenæus, I. xxv.). It also appears in the apocryphal correspondence between Abgar of Edessar and our Lord, preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* I. xiii. Of the *third* century the following Christian Fathers among others refer to it:— Hippolytus, *De Antichristo*, 45; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, vi. 6; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 43; cf. in *Lucam*, Hom. iv.; in *Joann.* ii. 30; Cyprian, *Testim. adv. Jud.* ii. ch. xxiv. In the *fourth* century reference may be made to Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* iv. 11; xiv. 18, 19. Athanasius, *Orat. contr. Arian.* iii. 23, 29; *Epist. ad Epict.* 6; Hilary of

cited from writers of the second century are sufficient to establish the early and widespread belief of the Church in the *fact* of the descent into hell. They also give evidence of the belief that the descent brought with it some benefit to those of the Old Covenant to whom Christ preached.

Turning now to the creeds of the Church it is to be noticed that the clause, "He descended into hell," is not found in a single Eastern one. It is therefore wanting in the Nicene Creed. Nor is it to be found in the earlier creeds of the West. The first creed of any kind to contain the clause is that which was apparently drawn up at Sirmium and accepted at Ariminum in 359. This creed, although a Latin one, is only known to us through the Greek translation of it preserved by Socrates in his *Ecclesiastical History* (bk. ii. ch. xxxvii.). In it we find the words: "Was crucified and died and descended into hell (*εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα*), and disposed matters there; at the sight of whom the door-keepers of Hades (*πυλωροὶ ᾅδου*) trembled."[1] It has been suggested with some probability that the clause may have been thus prominently placed in this creed "the more effectually to blind the eyes of the orthodox."[2] The fact of the descent was important in connection with the views which were afterwards developed into the Apollinarian heresy. If admitted, it was a direct proof of the existence of the human soul in Christ, for this alone could have been the subject of the descent. It may be, therefore, that the

of Poictiers, *Tract. in Ps.* cxxxviii. 22; Basil, *In Ps.* xlviii. 9; Ambrose, *De Exc. Fratris.* ii. 103. At the close of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth century there are allusions in Jerome, *In Dan.* ch. iii.; *In Esai.* bk. vi. ch. xiv., *In Ezec.* bk. iii. ch. xii., *In Osee*, bk. iii. ch. xiii.; Augustine, *De Genesi ad literam*, xii. 53, *Epist. ad Evod.*; and, later, see Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. Pasch.* xx.

[1] The last phrase is clearly suggested by the LXX. in Job. xxxviii. 17, *πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾅδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν.*

[2] Cf. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 134.

Arians hoped that by this ostentatious profession of a belief, which by implication overthrew their own heretical denial of the human soul in Christ, they might draw off attention from their inadequate statements on the real point at issue between them and the orthodox party, and thus secure the acceptance of their creed. However this may be, the occurrence of the article in this creed of theirs is to be noticed as being historically its first appearance in any formal creed of any sort. Some forty years later we meet with it for the first time in a *Baptismal* creed, namely, in that of the Church of Aquileia, in which it occurs in the form, *descendit in inferna*. Our knowledge of this is due to Rufinus (A.D. 400), who expressly informs us that at that time the clause was not in the creed of the Church of Rome.[1] We come across it next in the creed given by Venantius Fortunatus (570), which is clearly based on the Aquileian Creed of Rufinus. Here it is given in the form, *descendit ad infernum.*"[2] The plural (*inferna*) is found in the form given in the Gallican service books.[3] In Spain it is met with in the creed given by Ildefonsus of Toledo, and Etherius and Beatus in the seventh and eighth centuries (*descendit ad inferna*),[4] although it is wanting in the creed given in the printed Mozarabic Missal.[5] In Ireland it is found in the creed contained in the Bangor Antiphonary, which dates from the seventh century (680–691).[6] Here it occurs

[1] Rufinus, *In Symb.* 18. Dr. Swete thinks that the clause cannot have been of recent introduction in the days of Rufinus, and is inclined to assign it to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, as a protest against the Docetic heresy. See his work on *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 61.

[2] Expos. xi.

[3] "Missale Gallicanum," *Migne*, vol. lxxii. p. 349. "Sacramentarium Gallicanum," *ibid.* p. 489.

[4] See Hahn, *Bibl. der Symbole*, p. 35.

[5] *Migne*, vol. lxxxv., p. 395.

[6] *The Antiphonary of Bangor*, fol. 19 (H. Bradshaw Soc.)

perhaps for the first time in the form *descendit ad inferos*; and after this it is generally met with in one or other of its forms.

NOTE.—It has not been thought necessary in considering this article to say anything of the various interpretations which have sometimes been put upon the words, but which really evacuate them of their plain meaning, *e.g.* that of Durandus, which explains them of a "virtual motion and efficacious presence," or that of Calvin, that the descent into hell consisted in suffering the torments of Gehenna. A refutation of these and some other strange and fanciful interpretations may be found in Pearson's work *On the Creed*. But at the same time it may be well to warn the readers that in his section on this article of the creed Pearson has written "less lucidly than is his wont." (1) He begins with an erroneous statement concerning the Creed of Aquileia, in which he asserts (contrary to fact) that the word *sepultus* was wanting. Rufinus clearly shows that it contained both *sepultus* and *descendit in inferna*. (2) He mistakes the meaning of Rufinus, from whose language he infers that "the first intention of putting these words in the creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour," whereas all that Rufinus intends to say is that the clause *sepultus* in the Roman and Oriental Creeds includes the notion of the descent of the soul into Hades, as well as the committal of the body to the grave. (3) He is misled by the erroneous reading, τῷ πνεύματι, in 1 Pet. iii. 18, and gives what can only be called a forced and non-natural interpretation of the whole passage, denying its reference to the descent into hell at all. (4) He nowhere distinguishes clearly between Hades and Gehenna, and ends by confusing the two, and directly asserting that Christ descended into Gehenna. "By the descent into hell, all

those which believe in Him are secured from descending thither. He went into those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there." An excellent study of the whole subject of this article may be found in Dean Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, No. iii.

ARTICLE IV

De Resurrectione Christi.

Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanæ naturæ pertinentibus, recepit, cum quibus in cœlum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus est.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly arise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day.

This article has remained practically unchanged since the publication of the Edwardian series in 1553.[1] Its language differs considerably from that of the corresponding article in the Confession of Augsburg, as well as from that in the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which was taken almost word for word from the Third Article of that formulary.[2] The emphatic assertion of the *truth* of the resurrection and of the *reality* of the human nature of the risen Lord indicates that the special object of the article was to guard against the Docetic views adopted

[1] In 1553 and 1563 the title in the Latin was "Resurrectio Christi," for which "De resurrectione Christi" was substituted in 1571 as harmonising better with the English. In the last clause the word "all" appears for the first time in the *English* edition published in 1563. The corresponding word *omnes* in the Latin found in modern texts is wanting not only in the published editions of 1553 and 1563, but also in that of 1571 by John Dayes, *auctoritate serenissimæ reginæ*.

[2] "Item descendit ad inferos et vere resurrexit tertia die, deinde ascendit ad cœlos, ut sedeat ad dexteram Patris, et perpetuo regnet et dominetur omnibus creaturis, sanctificet credentes in ipsum, misso in corde eorum Spiritu Sancto, qui regat, consoletur, ac vivificet eos, ac defendat adversus Diabolum et vim peccati. Item Christus palam est rediturus ut judicet vivos et mortuos etc. juxta symbolum apostolorum. Article III. of 1538. Cf. *Conf. August.* Art. iii. "De Filio Dei."

by some of the Anabaptists, which was associated with a further error as to the nature of the risen body, practically amounting to a denial of the existence of the humanity of Christ since the resurrection. This error is described and condemned in the following passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which illustrates the meaning and shows the intention of this article.

"Circa duplicem Christi naturam perniciosus est et varius error: ex quibus alii sunt ex Arianorum secta, Christum ita ponentes hominem ut Deum negent. Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cœlo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam præterfluxerit. *Quidam verbum in carnis naturam conversum asserunt, quam, quamprimum a morte in cœlum fuit recepta, rursus volunt in naturam divinam reversam et absorptam esse.* Quorum illi delirium imitantur, qui corpori Christi tam latos fines dant, ut illo credant aut omnes locos simul, aut innumeros obsideri. Quod si confiteremur, humanam e Christo naturam eximeremus. Quemadmodum enim Dei natura sibi hoc assumit, ut per omnia permeet, sic humanæ semper illud attributum est, ut certis locorum finibus circumscripta sit. Quidam corpus ipsum sæpe dicunt, et subinde factum esse. Qui errores omnes Sacrarum Scripturarum authoritate sic corrigendi sunt, ut Christus meliore natura Deus sempiternus accipiatur, et quidem æqualis sit Dei Patris; humana vero corpus habeat extempore factum, neque sæpius quam semel, neque ex alia materia quam ex Mariæ virginis vera et sola subsistantia ac quemadmodum reliqua humana corpora suis loci finibus circumscriptum."[1]

This extract—and particularly the portion of it in italics—makes it quite clear that when this article was

[1] *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, "De Hæres." ch. 5.

first drawn up there was much erroneous teaching on the nature of our Lord's humanity, and that there was in some quarters an inclination to deny that after the resurrection it continued to be in any sense true human nature. Hence the need for this article asserting not only that Christ *truly* arose, but also that He took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended,etc."

The three principal subjects which require consideration are the following :—

1. The resurrection of Christ.
2. The ascension and session (at the right hand of the Father).
3. The return to judgment.

I. *The Resurrection of Christ.*

The article is concerned with this simply as an historical fact. Questions, therefore, of its significance, its bearing upon our Lord's claims, its position as the central fact round which other doctrines group themselves, its witness to our acceptance with God, its revelation of the unseen world and our relation to it—important as all these are—do not directly come before us here.[1] The points to be considered in connection with the statements of the article are two—

(*a*) The evidence for the fact of the resurrection ; and

(*b*) The nature of the resurrection body.

(*a*) The evidence for the fact of the resurrection. In the forefront must always be placed the witness of S. Paul. His epistles were all—or nearly all—written some time before the gospel narratives were committed to writing. Doubts have, it is true, been freely cast

[1] Reference may be made on all these subjects to Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, or Milligan's *Lectures on the Resurrection*.

on the genuineness of some of them. But all except the most sceptical of critics will admit that First and Second Corinthians, Romans and Galatians, were written between the years A.D. 52 and 60, by the apostle whose name they bear. And these epistles alone are amply sufficient to prove not merely that the fact of the resurrection was believed in by the whole Church at the time when they were written, but that the belief in it grew up at the time of the alleged event, on the spot, and that the Church was immediately reconstructed on the basis of the resurrection. The most striking passage of all is that in 1 Cor. xv., where S. Paul enumerates the appearances of the risen Jesus, and stakes everything on the truth of the resurrection. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ." But apart from this the belief is bound up with the apostle's whole life, and underlies his whole teaching. There is scarcely an epistle in which he does not allude to it. "The literal fact of the resurrection is the implied and acknowledged groundwork of the apostle's teaching."[1] S. Paul's conversion is generally dated A.D. 35 or 36. The crucifixion probably took place in A.D. 28. Thus we see from the witness of S. Paul that, within eight years of the alleged event, the belief in it was universally held by Christians, for the witness of his epistles is of such a character as entirely to exclude the notion that the belief can have grown up or come to be widely accepted after his conversion. The belief is thus pushed back to an earlier date, which leaves no time for the gradual growth of legend or myth.

[1] Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 105. The only epistles of S. Paul in which there is no direct reference to the resurrection are Second Thessalonians, Titus, and Philemon.

Next to the witness of the Apostle of the Gentiles may be placed that of the Apostle of the Circumcision. S. Peter's First Epistle begins with the doctrine of "the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. i. 3), which is referred to as a known and acknowledged fact again in ch. i. 21 and iii. 21.

Reference may also be made to the early preaching of the apostles as preserved in the Acts of the Apostles. The tendency of modern criticism is on the whole to confirm more and more S. Luke's accuracy as an historian, and we cannot doubt that in these early chapters we have a faithful representation of the history of the first days of the Christian Church, and of the character of the apostolic preaching. We find, then, not only that Matthias was elected at S. Peter's suggestion, in the place of the traitor Judas, to be "a witness of the resurrection" (Acts i. 22), but that the literal fact of the resurrection occupies the foremost position in S. Peter's own speeches on the day of Pentecost (ii. 24–36); in Solomon's Porch (iii. 15; cf. iv. 33); before the Council (v. 30); and in the house of Cornelius (x. 40).

The evidence, thus summarised, is independent of that in the Gospels. Much, if not all of it, would still remain, even if they could be shown to be comparatively late compilations. But the fact that there is such a wealth of testimony to the truth of the resurrection affords a striking confirmation of the veracity of the evangelists' accounts of it. The fact is, of course, stated by all four evangelists. On some details their narratives may be hard to harmonise, but on the main fact their witness is clear and precise, and leaves no room for doubt that they at least believed the resurrection as a true and literal fact. "Indeed," says Bishop Westcott, "taking all the evidence together, it is not too much to say that there is no single historic incident better or more variously

supported than the resurrection of Christ. Nothing but the antecedent assumption that it must be false could have suggested the idea of deficiency in the proof of it."[1]

One minor point deserves a brief notice before leaving the subject of the witness of Scripture to the resurrection. It will be observed that the article asserts that "Christ did truly *arise*." It is sometimes stated that this is not the way in which the fact is represented in Scripture, as there the action is ascribed to the Father, who is said to have *raised* Christ from the dead. Certainly, it is true that in the vast majority of instances the Father is spoken of as the agent, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ is regarded as an awakening effected by His power (see Acts iii. 15, iv. 10, v. 30, x. 40; Rom. iv. 24, viii. 11, etc.). But there are other passages in which it is spoken of definitely as a rising again on the part of the Son.[2] In S. John ii. 19 our Lord Himself says distinctly "of the temple of His body" "I will raise it up," while in x. 18 He expressly asserts His right not only to "lay down" His life, but to "take it again." And if He could thus claim the action as His own, it will surely be felt that no further justification is required for the use of the active voice "arise" in this article as in the creeds of the Church.[3]

(*b*) *The nature of the resurrection body.*—The state-

[1] *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 133. Fuller consideration of the evidence of the resurrection is not attempted here, because it seems to belong more properly to the subject of Christian evidences. For a careful statement of it, and a criticism of the theory of visions, reference may be made to Row's *Bampton Lectures*. vi. and vii.

[2] Cf. Westcott on S. John ii. 22.

[3] In the Western Creeds the word used is always *resurrexit*. In those of the East it is as regularly ἀναστάντα. Ἐγείρεσθαι, the passive, is the word more commonly used in Scripture, but ἀναστῆναι and ἀνέστη occur in S. Mark viii. 31, ix. 9, xvi. 9; S. Luke xxiv. 7, 46; S. John xx. 9; Acts x. 41, xvii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 14.

ment of the article that **Christ . . . took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature,** is one which very closely follows the language of Holy Scripture. That it was the crucified body which our Lord took again is plainly taught by the evangelists. It still bore the marks of the passion, for "He showed unto them His hands and His side" (S. John xx. 20). The reality of His body is evidenced by the fact that He ate before the disciples (S. Luke xxiv. 43; cf. Acts x. 41). When "they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit," He reassures them with the words, "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have" (St. Luke xxiv. 36–40). All these passages mark very clearly the reality and identity of the resurrection body. Yet there are other passages which indicate with equal clearness that a change has passed over it. It was the same, and yet different. The body has not been left in the grave, but it has been transfigured and endowed with new powers. He appears in their midst when "the doors were shut" (S. John xx. 19). He vanishes out of the sight of the two at Emmaus as suddenly and mysteriously as He appears in the midst of the ten (S. Luke xxiv. 31). And finally, in the last scene on the Mount of Olives, "as they were looking He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight" (Acts i. 10). Thus are taught the two lessons of the *reality* of the resurrection body, and its *glorification.* "There is sown a natural body; there is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 44). Of the actual nature of the resurrection body we know but little, and that little is drawn entirely from the statements of Scripture. It is perhaps impossible for us in our present condition to form any distinct conception of it, or to understand the

laws which regulate its presence and action. We can do little more than note the indications of its nature to be found in Holy Scripture. And the passages referred to above make it perfectly clear that while personal identity is preserved and bodily structure remains, yet its presence and appearance is governed by laws which are entirely different from those to which the "natural body" is subject. It is a glorified, and a "spiritual" body. Further, S. Paul expressly tells us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 50), in connection with which statement we cannot fail to see a deep significance in the fact that when our Lord would describe His risen body to the disciples He speaks of it not in the familiar phrase "flesh and blood," but makes use of the unique expression "flesh and bones" (S. Luke xxiv. 39). This language is carefully repeated in our own article ("took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature), and without venturing to assert that the resurrection body was bloodless, we may safely say that the unique phrase employed by our Lord was designedly chosen to convey a different idea from the ordinary term "flesh and blood." This latter expression occurs in S. Matthew xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14. In the last of these passages it is used of our Lord's incarnate life before the crucifixion. "Since the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same." It is here used to denote that He took upon Him man's nature *under its present conditions*,[1] "flesh and blood" being, as will be

[1] See Bishop Westcott's notes on the passage, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 52, where it is pointed out that by the use of the phrase αἷμα καὶ σάρξ "stress is laid on the element which is the symbol of life as subject to corruption."

seen from the other passages where it occurs, a term with earthly associations connected with it, suggestive rather of the lower animal life than of the higher spiritual existence. "Flesh and bones" is altogether a nobler expression. Its meaning may be gathered from such passages as Gen. ii. 23, xxix. 14; Judges ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 12, 13. These may suggest that it denotes "community, kinship, close personal union and relationship"; and thus it is indicative of the change that has passed over the body of the risen Saviour, that though in His incarnate life before the crucifixion He "partook" of "flesh and blood," yet after the resurrection He claims not this, but "flesh and bones." He would teach His disciples that He was not formless spirit. But to have said that He was "flesh and blood" would have misled them into the idea that He was exactly what He had been. He therefore says that He has "flesh and bones," in proof that, while He had undergone a change, that change still left Him truly human.[1]

II. *The Ascension and Session (at the Right Hand of the Father).*

(*a*) The fact of the ascension, though clearly stated, has comparatively little stress laid upon it in Holy Scripture. Of the four evangelists, neither S. Matthew nor S. John relate it, although the latter has preserved words of our Lord which directly refer to it, and so may be said to assume it as a well-known fact (See S. John iii. 13, vi. 62; xx. 17). It is just mentioned—but nothing more—at the close of S. Mark's Gospel, in the section the authorship of which is disputed (S. Mark xvi. 19). In St. Luke's Gospel, accord-

[1] Milligan *On the Resurrection*, p. 242. The whole note is suggestive, and on the nature of the resurrection body reference may be further made to the first lecture in the same volume.

ing to the received text, a brief notice of it is given, but the words referring to it are marked in Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament* as a "western non-interpolation," being omitted in an important group of early authorities.[1] S. Luke has, however, preserved a full account of it in the Acts of the Apostles (i. 9–11), to which it forms the proper introduction as the preparation for the day of Pentecost.

In S. Paul's Epistles there are but two direct references to it, namely, in Eph. iv. 8–10: "Wherefore He saith, when He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now this, He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things." 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Received up in glory" (*ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ*). S. Peter in his First Epistle (iii. 22), speaks of Christ as having "gone into heaven." But though direct notices of the actual ascension are but few, the fact is implied and assumed not only in all those passages referred to below, which speak of the session at the right hand of the Father, but also in the whole conception of the priestly work of Christ as described in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in the representation of the glorified Christ in the Apocalypse.

The mystery of the ascension is one which it is peculiarly difficult for finite minds such as ours to grasp. We have to guard against thinking of it as a mere change of position from one place to another. As heaven is a state rather than a place, so the ascension involves a change of the mode of existence rather than

[1] The words *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, S. Luke xxiv. 51, are omitted in ℵ D, *a b c ff rhe*. The recently discovered Old Syriac Version, however, which generally agrees with the "Western" group reads the verse as follows: "And while He blessed them, He was lifted up from them."

a change of position. And yet we are not to think of it as if it brought about the destruction of our Lord's manhood or its absorption into Deity. The Mediator between God and man is still "Himself man" (1 Tim. ii. 5). By the ascension He "has entered upon the completeness of spiritual being, without lessening in any degree the completeness of His humanity. . . . We cannot indeed unite the two sides [of the thought] in one conception, but we can hold both firmly without allowing the one truth to infringe upon the other."[1] This we can do, and with this we must rest content. And so with regard to that "heaven" into which He passed when "a cloud received Him out of their sight"; the following words of a thoughtful and devout theologian seem to state very exactly the two sides of the truth which, if we are loyal to scriptural truth, we find ourselves compelled to maintain concerning it:

"We cannot conceive of heaven as any distinct place —some sphere, some distant world, or the like—some distinct 'where,' according to the ideas of our present sensible perceptions; because heaven is everywhere that God is. Yet we must persuade ourselves of some more definite place in heaven where the cosmical, the created life, is perfectly realised; where God Himself is all in all, where the fragmentary, the imperfect, inseparable from existence in time, is lifted up into the fulness of eternity."[2]

(*b*) As in the Apostles' Creed, the words, "He ascended into heaven," are immediately followed by the clause, "And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty," so in the article after, **wherewith He ascended into heaven,** we read, **and there sitteth.** The phrase employed once more is entirely scriptural.

[1] Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 81.

[2] Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (E. T.), p. 321.

In the Old Testament it is used of the Messianic King in Ps. cx. 1: "The Lord said unto My Lord, sit thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." Its occurrence in this passage evidently suggested its use in the New Testament, in which it may be fairly said to be the regular phrase employed to describe the condition of the risen and glorified Saviour. So in [S. Mark] xvi. 19 we read that "the Lord Jesus . . . was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God." In Rom. viii. 32 it is said that "Christ Jesus," who was raised from the dead, "is at the right hand of God." In Col. iii. 1, He is spoken of as "seated on the right hand of God." Heb. x. 12: "He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."[1] In all these passages, wherever the position is indicated, it is that of *sitting*. One exception to this there is in the New Testament. In Acts vii. 55 S. Stephen says: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man *standing* on the right hand of God." It is remarkable that the phrase should occur here and here only; and there can be little doubt that S. Chrysostom is right in the interpretation which he puts upon the unusual expression. "Why standing, and not sitting? To show that He is ready to succour His martyr. For thus it is said also of the Father, 'Stand up, O God,' and 'now will I up, saith the Lord, I will set him in safety.'"[2]

It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to point out that the expression, "Sitteth at the right hand of God," is to be taken metaphorically, and that, as Bishop Pearson says, "we must not look upon it as determining any posture

[1] In Acts ii. 33, it is doubtful whether the words should be rendered, "Being *by* the right hand of God exalted," or "Being *at* the right hand of God exalted."

[2] Hom. vi. in *Ascens.*

of His body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs."[1] Both parts of the expression are valuable for the ideas and thoughts which they are intended to bring before us. *Sitting* is suggestive of continuance, of rest after labour, of the king upon his throne, and the judge upon the judgment-seat. The *right hand* is the symbol of strength and power. It is the position of honour and dignity; and, as Pearson adds, "the right hand of God is the place of celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the psalmist, 'In Thy presence is fulness of joy, at Thy right hand pleasures for evermore.'"

(*c*) Before leaving the subject of the ascension and session at the right hand of God, there is one question arising in connection with it which demands a brief consideration: How far can the risen and ascended Lord be said to be present everywhere *as man*? At the time when the Articles were drawn up the subject had been brought prominently forward on the continent, owing to the unfortunate teaching of some of the Lutheran divines, following Luther himself who, in the course of the controversy on the Lord's Supper, endeavoured to support his doctrine on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist by a theory of the ubiquity or omnipresence of the human nature of the Lord, of which theory it can only be said that it is altogether destructive of the reality of the manhood, and endows it with some, at least, of the essential properties of Deity, namely, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience.

That the subject was definitely present to the minds of those who compiled our Articles is plainly indicated by the passage from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, which has been already quoted as illustrative of this article. And the terms used in the article itself are

[1] *On the Creed*, Art. VI. ch. ii.

quite sufficient to show that those who drew it up had no sympathy with "Ubiquitarianism,"[1] but intended to attribute what can only be called a "local" presence to the body of Christ in heaven. He "took again His body . . . *wherewith* He ascended into heaven, and *there* sitteth until He return, etc." But while it is necessary to repudiate any teaching which would destroy the perfection of our Lord's humanity, and practically involve us in Eutychianism, it is at the same time equally needful to guard against imagining that there are in Christ two centres of personality, and that the two natures are in any way separated from each other, a view which would implicate us in something like Nestorianism. The subject is carefully discussed by Hooker, whose guidance we may thankfully follow. In the fifty-fifth chapter of the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* he points out—(1) That "the substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have but only local"; (2) That "there is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body, but by the true and natural properties of His body, amongst which properties definite or local presence is chief"; (3) That "if his majestical body have now any such new property, by force whereof it may everywhere really, even *in substance*, present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of his estate extinguished the verity of His nature." Consequently he holds it "a most infallible truth that Christ as man is not everywhere present." But, having said this, he proceeds at once to add that *in some sense* it may be granted that even as man He is everywhere present. "His human substance in itself is naturally absent from

[1] The "Ubiquitarians" are frequently alluded to by Bishop Jewel in his letters. See his *Works* (Parker Soc.) vol. iv. pp. 1258, 1261, 1264.

the earth, His soul and body not on earth but in heaven only. Yet because the substance is inseparably joined to that personal Word which, by His very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort*, by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present. . . Wheresoever the Word is, it hath with it manhood, else should the Word be in part or somewhere God only and not man, which is impossible." Thus there results (*a*) a *sort of presence* of the manhood *by conjunction.*

Again, there is a second way in which a kind of universal presence may be attributed to the manhood. It has (*b*) *a presence of co-operation*, for "that Deity of Christ which, before our Lord's Incarnation wrought all things without man, doth now work nothing wherein the nature which it hath assumed is either absent from it or idle." "Touching the manner how He worketh as man in all things, the principal powers of the soul of man are the will and the understanding, the one of which two in Christ assenteth unto all things, and from the other nothing which Deity doth work is hid;[1] so that by knowledge and assent the soul of Christ is present with all things which the Deity of Christ worketh." Further, of the body of Christ it may be said, that "although the definite limitation thereof be most sensible," yet in some sort it, too, admits of a "kind of infinite and unlimited presence." It is an integral part of that human nature which is nowhere severed from Deity, and thus a

[1] Lest it should be said that this gives to the manhood an essential property of Deity, namely, "omniscience," it will be well for the reader to refer back to what Hooker has said in a previous chapter on the illumination of the human soul of Christ, "which being so inward unto God cannot choose but be privy unto all things which God worketh, and must therefore of necessity be endued with knowledge so far forth universal, though not with infinite knowledge peculiar to Deity itself." *Eccl. Polity*, bk. v. ch. liv. § 7.

" presence of conjunction " may be ascribed to it. " And forasmuch as it is by virtue of that conjunction made the body of the Son of God, by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it *a presence of force and efficacy* throughout all generations of men. Albeit, therefore, nothing be *actually* infinite *in substance* but God only in that He is God, nevertheless as every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ; it hath no measured certainty of limits, bounds of efficacy unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application.*" [1]

III. *The Return to Judgment.*

The concluding words of the article, **Until He return to judge all men at the last day,** merely repeat the substance of the corresponding article in the Creed, " from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead," without in any way explaining or elaborating it. It does not appear that there was any special form of false teaching on this subject, which the statement was intended to combat. Errors with regard to eschatology are plainly and directly condemned in Articles XXXIX. to XLII. of the series of 1553, but in the article before us the mention of the judgment is probably introduced incidentally rather than polemically, as being the natural close of the dispensation referred to in the previous clause, " On the session at the right hand of the Father." It will, then, be sufficient to notice here how the article accurately follows Scripture—(*a*) in pointing to the Redeemer as also the Judge, and

[1] The subject of the presence of Christ as Man is fully considered in Augustine's *Epistola ad Dardanum*, " De Præsentia Dei," Ep. clxxxvii.

(*b*) in connecting this judgment with His second advent, and not with the moment of each man's death.

(*a*) It is the teaching of Scripture that the second Person of the Holy Trinity, who has come as the Saviour of the world, shall also "come to be our Judge." See S. Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 37, xxv. 31; Acts i. 11, x. 42; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2, etc.

(*b*) The time of the judgment is not the moment of each man's death, but what Scripture terms "the last day."[1] See S. Matt. xiii. 39 *seq.*, xxv. 31–33; Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 5, 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 9, 10, etc.

[1] See S. John vi. 39 *seq.*; xi. 24; xii. 48.

ARTICLE V

De Spiritu Sancto.

Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiæ, majestatis et gloriæ, verus ac æternus Deus.

Of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

THERE was no article corresponding to this in the series published in 1553. Ten years later (1563) this was added by Archbishop Parker, being taken by him substantially from the Confession of Würtemburg. The reason for its insertion was possibly twofold—(1) The spread of false teaching concerning the distinct Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit. That these truths were impugned by some at the time of the Reformation is shown by the first of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which ends with a condemnation of "Samosa tenos veteres *et neotericos*, qui cum tantum unam personam esse contendant, de Verbo et Spiritu Sancto astute et impie rhetoricantur, quod non sint personæ distinctæ, sed quod verbum significet verbum vocale, et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum"; while the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* supplies further proof how necessary it was to guard against error on this subject, for after language referring to other heresies it proceeds as follows: "Sic illorum etiam est execrabilis impudentia, qui cum Macedonio contra Spiritum Sanctum con-

spiraverunt, illum pro Deo non agnoscentes."[1] But while these quotations witness to the prevalence of error, a recollection of the date to which the documents from which they are drawn belong, shows that they describe the state of things that obtained before the publication of the Articles of Edward's reign; and it may fairly be asked why there was no article repudiating these errors in that series. The answer may perhaps be found in the supposition that it was considered that they were sufficiently condemned by the terms of Article I. ("Of the Holy Trinity"), the language of which our present Fifth Article partially repeats, adding only a statement on the procession of the Holy Spirit. Since, however, the same would hold good also of the Elizabethan article, it appears probable that Archbishop Parker's addition was due, not so much to the felt need of more precise and definite language, as (2) to the desire to give the document the character of greater completeness. If there was an article on the Son of God it may well have been felt that the lack of a corresponding article on the Third Person of the Holy Trinity was a deficiency which it would be wise to supply, for the sake of symmetry and proper balance, even though there was no positive necessity for it arising from heresy, which without it would not be excluded.

The subjects which call for attention in connection with this article are three in number:

1. The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.
2. The distinct Personality.
3. The doctrine of the Procession.

I. *The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

It is hard to understand how this can ever have been

[1] *Ref. Leg. Eccl.* "De hæres." ch. 6. Even so late as the middle of the seventeenth century, Bishop Pearson speaks of "the ancient but newly-revived heresy of the Arians and Macedonians.—*On the Creed*, Art. viii.

doubted; and it is probable that but few persons will be found in the present day to question it. The evidence of Scripture upon it is full and complete, and leaves no room whatever for doubt as to its teaching. Not only are divine actions and attributes ascribed to the Spirit, but also He is directly termed God.

(*a*) *Divine actions and attributes are ascribed to the Spirit.*—In the Old Testament the references to the action of the Spirit of God in creation (Gen. i. 2; Ps. xxxiii. 6), and in inspiring the prophets (Isa. lxi. 1), whatever may be thought of their bearing on the doctrine of His distinct Personality, are manifestly inconsistent with the notion that He is a *κτίσμα*. His work in bringing about the Incarnation can only belong to one who is in the highest sense divine. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God" (S. Luke i. 35). The Spirit dwells in the bodies of men as in a temple. See 1 Cor. iii. 16: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" Compare 1 Cor. vi. 19: "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" is an offence of so heinous a character that it is spoken of as a sin which "hath never forgiveness" (S. Mark iii. 29), whereas all other blasphemies may be forgiven—a fact which it is impossible to reconcile with any other supposition but that of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

(*b*) But, besides this, the Spirit is directly termed God. In Acts v. 3, 4, Peter says to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to *lie to the Holy Ghost?* . . . thou hast not lied unto men, but *unto God.*" Thus to lie to the Holy Ghost is to lie to God.

2 Cor. iii. 15–18: "Unto this day, whensoever Moses

is read, a veil lieth upon their hearts. But whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit." "The Spirit is here so plainly said to be *the Lord*, that is *Jehovah*, the one eternal God, that the adversaries of this truth must either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or that the *Spirit* is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denials must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainness of the apostle's discourse."[1]

Again, whereas in one Gospel we read: "If I by *the finger of God* cast out devils" (S. Luke xi. 20), in the parallel passage in another we read, "If I by *the Spirit of God* cast out devils" (S. Matt. xii. 28), and whereas Isaiah describes a divine utterance that came to him, and says, "I heard the voice of the Lord" (Isa. vi. 8), St. Paul quotes the words as an utterance of the Holy Spirit (Acts xxviii. 25 *seq.*), thereby identifying Him with the Jehovah of the Old Covenant.

II. *The Distinct Personality.*

If it is difficult to understand how the doctrine of the Spirit's Divinity could ever be doubted, with the doctrine of His distinct personality the case is very different. It is not hard to see how error would be likely to grow up on this subject. The same term, πνεῦμα, is used in Holy Scripture both for the *Person*, and for the *spiritual gifts*. It is largely owing to this that men have sometimes failed to see the truth of the distinct Personality, and have imagined that where-

[1] Pearson *On the Creed* Art. viii.

ever the "Spirit of God" is mentioned, it is an impersonal attribute or quality, or an endowment granted to man as a divine gift. Careful consideration, however, of the language used in Holy Scripture makes it quite clear that such a view is wholly inadequate. It will be seen that, throughout the New Testament, *personal actions* are ascribed to the Spirit, and such actions as cannot be predicated of the Father or the Son. Our Lord's discourses in the upper chamber on the eve of His passion (S. John xiii.–xvi.) deal largely with the subject of the Holy Spirit, whom He would send from the Father, or whom the Father would send in His name (xiv. 26, xv. 26), as "another Comforter" or "Advocate" (*ἄλλον παράκλητον*). The use of this term seems of itself decisive. Whatever be the exact translation of *παράκλητος* the title is certainly a personal one. It is applied to our Lord in 1 John ii. 1, and if the Spirit is to be "another Paraclete," He must not only be distinct from the Son, and from the Father, by whom He is "sent," but must equally be a Person. Further, the masculine pronoun is used, "*He* (*ἐκεῖνος*) shall teach you all things" (S. John xiv. 26), and such personal actions are ascribed to Him as teaching, reminding, bearing witness, convicting of sin, guiding into truth, declaring things to come, glorifying Christ, taking of the things of Christ, and declaring them to the disciples (xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 8–14). But the proof of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost is not confined to these chapters of S. John's Gospel. The apostolic epistles are full of passages which testify to the same truth. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself (*αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα*) maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh

intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. viii. 26, 27). The Spirit here can only be thought of as distinct from the Father with whom He intercedes, nor can there be any personification of, or confusion with, the human spirit, since the Spirit "helpeth our infirmities," and "maketh intercession for us." And though, undoubtedly, such attributes as love are personified in Scripture, and personal actions ascribed to them, which are really done by the men in whom they reside (see *e.g.* 1 Cor. xiii.), yet such a passage as 1 Cor. xii. 4 *seq.* is decisive against the notion that the language of the apostle concerning the Spirit may be explained in the same way. Here the Spirit of God is spoken of as apportioning the gifts of grace. He is expressly distinguished from the gifts which He assigns to men, and personal action is markedly attributed to Him. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; to another faith, in the same Spirit; to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will." The Personality of the Holy Spirit is evident throughout this passage. "Even as He will" could be said of no influence or attribute. Many other passages to the same effect might be quoted. Elsewhere we read of the Spirit being "grieved" (Eph. iv. 30), of men being "led by the Spirit" (Gal. v. 18). It is possible to "lie to the Holy Ghost" (Acts v. 4), and to "blaspheme against Him" (S. Matt. xii. 31). Language

such as this is surely conclusive. It would be inexplicable and misleading if the Spirit were only an attribute, influence, gift, or operation. He is plainly revealed in the Holy Spirit as a divine Hypostasis, distinct from both the Father and the Son—the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity.

It may be added, with reference to the use of the same term, *πνεῦμα*, both for the Person and the gift, that a comparison of passages will show that as a rule where the gift, operation, or communication of the Spirit is spoken of in Scripture, the word *πνεῦμα* is without the article. Where the word is definite, *τὸ πνεῦμα*, it will generally, if not always, be found that the divine Person is designated.[1]

Before passing on to the subject of the procession, it will be well to notice briefly the history of the doctrine of the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

In the earliest ages comparatively little attention was paid to the subject. The doctrine was held, so to speak, in an *informal* manner. The witness of hymns, doxologies, and professions of faith, as well as the incidental statements of early Fathers, all combine to convince us that the Church had no real doubts on the Divinity or Personality of the Holy Ghost, although the doctrine was not formally and dogmatically stated, and occasionally there are traces of a confusion of thought and language, so that not only are acts and operations ascribed to the Son which would be properly assigned to the Spirit, but the Spirit is actually identified with the Son.[2] Such passages are, however, rare; and against

[1] See Dean Vaughan, *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 103, and cf. Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

[2] See Ps. Clement, 2 *Cor.* ix. and xiv. Hermas, *Pastor. Sim.* v. ix.; *Theoph. ad Autolyc.* ii. 23; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 33, where the Incarnation is said to have been wrought by the Word Himself, though

them may be set the witness of many others, which show that the doctrine was recognised from the beginning.[1] "The Catholic doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost," it has been truly said, "found a place from the first in the life and worship of the Church; in her worship because in her life. Yet the dogmatic expression of this truth will be sought in vain among the outpourings of Christian devotion. Until heresy attacked one by one the treasures of the traditional creed, they were held firmly indeed, yet with a scarcely conscious grasp: the faithful were content to believe and to adore."[2]

The first recognition in any form of the fact that the doctrine had not hitherto received the attention due to it may be found in the outbreak of Montanism in the latter half of the second century. It has been said that Montanus claimed himself to be the Paraclete, but this assertion probably arises from a misunderstanding of his claim to be the inspired organ of the Spirit. According to the express statement of Epiphanius,[3] his views were sound on the subject of the Holy Trinity, and therefore the prominence which he gave to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit may be taken as "the first expression of a need already beginning to make itself felt—the need of a fuller recognition of the Person and work of the Holy Ghost."[4]

In the early days of the Sabellian heresy the subject

elsewhere Justin clearly distinguishes the Spirit from the Word, placing "in the third order" (ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει) the Spirit of prophecy "for we honour Him with the Word," *Apol.* i. 13.

[1] See Clement of Rome, 1 *Cor.* ii. xlv. xlvii. lviii.; Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* xiii.; *Philad.* vii.; *Eph.* ix. xviii.; *Mart. Polyc.* xiv. xxii.; *Theoph. ad Autol.* ii. 15; Athenagoras, *Legat.* x.; Irenæus, IV. xiv.; xxxiv. etc.

[2] Swete, *On the Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 8.

[3] *Hær.* xlviii.

[4] Swete, *op. cit.* p. 12.

of the Holy Spirit was not prominently brought forward, but as the controversy proceeded there were indications that the Sabellians were prepared to extend to the Third Person of the Trinity the principle of explanation which they applied to the second, and to regard the Spirit merely as a manifestation or character of the one Person whom they admitted as God. The subject, however, still remained in the background, nor was the attention of churchmen specially directed to it for some time yet. Indeed, it is not till a considerable time after the outbreak of the Arian heresy in the fourth century that it receives due consideration. The creed which received the sanction of the Fathers assembled at Nicæa (A.D. 325), being drawn up expressly to guard against Arianism, ended abruptly with the clause, "And in the Holy Ghost." All the clauses which follow this in our present (so-called) Nicene Creed were wanting, and the reason why this article of the faith was so brief and free from all elaboration was, if we may believe the express statement of S. Basil of Cæsarea, "because no question had as yet arisen on this subject." [1]

At the same time, it is necessary to remember that the denial of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was logically involved in the position of the Arians. If the Son is not "very and eternal God," but a "creature" (*κτίσμα*), what can be thought of the nature of the Spirit who is "sent" by Him, and is actually called in Scripture "the Spirit of Christ?" It is clear that on the Arian hypothesis the Spirit cannot be truly divine, or else He would be superior to the Son who "sends" Him. For a while, however, this inference remained in the background. The main question at stake was that

[1] Διὰ τὸ μηδέπω τοτε τοῦτο κινεῖσθαι τὸ ζήτημα, *Ep.* lxxviii. (*al.* cxxv., cf. cccxxv.; *al.* cclviii.).

of the Divinity of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It required time for the full issues and results that flowed from the Arian position to become manifest. Not till about the middle of the fourth century does the question of the nature and position of the Holy Spirit begin to assume importance in the controversy. The *Catechetical Lectures* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem were delivered in the year 347 or 348. In the creed on which S. Cyril commented, the article on the Holy Spirit, though slightly fuller than that in the Nicene Creed, was still lacking in crucial and decisive terms. It simply consisted of the words, "And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake by the prophets"; and S. Cyril's lecture upon it[1] makes it perfectly clear that he was aware of no recent development of heretical speculation upon the subject, for the only heresies against which he thinks it necessary to caution the catechumens whom he is instructing, are those of older days and of long standing, such as those of the Gnostics and the Montanists. But a very few years later, among the anathemas appended to the first Sirmian Creed (A.D. 351) are several which mark the rise of controversy on the Person of the Spirit. Those are condemned who speak of Him as the "ingenerate God," or as "one Person" with the Father and the Son, or as "a part of the Father or of the Son."[2] From this time onwards the battle rages round the subject, and the heresy associated with the name of Macedonius is developed by some among the semi-Arians, who shrank from the blasphemy of attributing a created nature to the Eternal Son. "Unable to grasp the Catholic conception of the Holy Trinity, unwilling to accept the Arian position as a whole, they fall back upon the middle course of giving up the Deity of the Spirit, while they confessed the Son

[1] S. Cyril, *Cat. Lect.* xvi. [2] Athan. *De Synodis*, 27.

to be of like essence with the Father."[1] In this way there arose the heresy of the Pneumatomachi (*πνευματομάχοι*), or Macedonians,[2] as they were also called, after Macedonius, the deposed Patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 360). Its essence consists in the denial of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. For a time it must have been most formidable. One Council after another condemns it,[3] and creeds are enlarged with fuller statements in order to exclude it. So in the (so-called) Nicene Creed we find the brief statement of the original creed expanded in the following manner:—"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life (*τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποῖον*), who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." These additions are found for the first time in the creed as given by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus* which was written in 373 or 374.[4] They were perhaps ratified

[1] Swete, *Early History*, p. 45.

[2] "Macedoniani sunt a Macedonio Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ Episcopo, quos et *πνευματομάχους* Græci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigent. Nam de Patre et Filio recte sentiant, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiæ vel essentiæ; sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes." — Augustine, "Hæres." 52. Of the share of Macedonius in propagating this heresy, but little is known. "His name makes no figure in the history of the controversy beyond its use in designating the sect."—Swete, p. 53.

[3] *E.g.* The four Synods at Rome under Damasus, between 368 and 381. See Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 287 *seq.*

[4] Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, §. 118. Compare also the other form of the creed given immediately afterwards by Epiphanius (§ 119) as that current since the days of Valens and Valentinian. In this the article on the Holy Ghost is still fuller. "And we believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake by the law and preached by the prophets, and came down at the Jordan, speaking by the apostles, dwelling in the saints. Thus we believe in Him that He is Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, perfect Spirit, the Spirit the Paraclete, uncreated, proceeding from the Father, and receiving of the Son, and believed on." There are also appended to this

and sanctioned by the Council of Constantinople in 381, a question which will have to be considered in connection with Article VIII. But however this may be, the Council in its first canon emphatically condemned and anathematised the heresy of the Macedonians, which from this time found place only without the Church; and henceforth the Divinity of the Holy Spirit and His place in the Godhead as the Third Person of the blessed Trinity was fully recognised and acknowledged as that which had been the implicit faith of the Church from the beginning, and which was now distinctly expressed in her formal and dogmatic decisions.

III. *The Doctrine of the Procession.*

In treating of the procession of the Holy Spirit, it will be convenient to consider—(*a*) the scriptural grounds for the doctrine, and its meaning; and (*b*) the history of its expression in the creed.

(*a*) *The Scripture grounds for the doctrine, and its meaning.*—The term "proceeding" is used by the Church to denote the manner in which the Holy Spirit derives His eternal Being from the Father, who is alone unoriginate (ἄναρχος).[1] As the property of the Son is "to be begotten," so the property of the Spirit is "to proceed." *What* the word ultimately denotes must ever remain a mystery in this life. But we cannot doubt that there is some real truth, and an eternal fact in the divine nature, indicated by the way in which Holy Scripture, while speaking of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as God's *Son*, and *begotten*, never makes use of these terms when speaking of the Third Person in the Godhead.

creed, anathemas of those who say that the Spirit once was not, or that He is of a different substance from the Father, or is liable to change or alteration.

[1] See Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxix.

Consequently the Church, following the guidance of Holy Scripture, has never ventured to employ them. Some word, however, was required to express the scriptural truth that the Spirit is not unoriginate, but issues forth from the Father. Early in the second century, Ignatius had spoken of the Spirit as being from God (*ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν*),[1] but it was impossible to avoid the use of some definite term. In the course of the fourth century we meet with various ones, especially *ἔκπεμψις*, *πρόοδος*, and *ἐκπόρευσις*, all of which are employed by writers of repute to describe the property of the Holy Spirit. The first of these terms, however, is open to the objection that it may lead to some confusion between the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit, who is "sent" in time by the Father and the Son, and His eternal procession as the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Accordingly the term which finally obtained widest acceptance and found a place in the creeds was "proceeding," *ἐκπορευόμενον*.[2] It was evidently suggested by the use of the expression in our Lord's discourse in S. John xv. 26. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, *which proceedeth from the Father* (*ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται*), He shall testify of Me." It is, however, not at all certain that in this passage our Lord intends to indicate the eternal relation of the Spirit to the Father by His use of the expression. It is possible that the phrase applies to His temporal mission to men, which is certainly the main subject of the discourse. But however this may be (and divines are not all

[1] Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* vii.

[2] For *ἔκπεμψις*, see S. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* xxiii., *Ἴδιον πατρὸς μὲν ἡ ἀγεννησία, υἱοῦ δὲ ἡ γέννησις, πνεύματος δὲ ἡ ἔκπεμψις.* *Πρόοδος* occurs in *Orat.* xiii. and *πνεῦμα πρόοδον* in *Orat.* i. Elsewhere in *Orat.* xxxix we read: *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς τὸ πνεῦμα, προϊὸν μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐχ ὑϊκῶς δὲ· οὐδὲ γὰρ γεννητῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκπορευτῶς.*

agreed on the point [1]) the selection of the term by the Church was a wise one, for it is entirely free from any associations of *Sonship*, and leaves the manner in which the Spirit "proceeds" or "issues forth" from the Eternal Fount of Deity unexplained. The Church makes no attempt to be wise above what is written, but is content to leave the mystery where Scripture leaves it.

But it may be urged that the creed as used in the Western Church, while borrowing our Lord's phrase to express this eternal fact, *does* attempt to be wise above what is written, and is not content to take the phrase as it stands in S. John's Gospel, but adds an important word to it, repeating it in the form "proceeding from the Father *and the Son*." How their last word (*Filioque*), which has never been received by the Eastern Church, came into the creed of the West will be explained later on. For the present we are concerned with the doctrine rather than the history. It must be admitted that the exact phrase is nowhere found in Scripture. But it is maintained that the *doctrine* which the phrase is intended to express is abundantly taught in Scripture.[2] One passage, indeed, approaches very near to being a verbal expression of it. In Rev. xxii. 1, we are told that S. John saw "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal,

[1] Bishop Westcott, who takes it of the temporal mission, lays stress on the fact that the preposition used in the Gospel is not (as in the creed) ἐκ, which would naturally be required to define the source, but παρά, "from the side of," which is habitually used of the mission of the Son. Godet, however, points out that it is difficult to refer the words, *who proceedeth from the Father* to the same fact as the former, *whom I will send to you from the Father*, as this would be mere tautology. Besides the future, πέμψω, *I will send*, refers to an historical fact to take place at an undefined period, while the present, ἐκπορεύεται, *proceedeth*, seems to refer to a permanent, divine, and therefore eternal relation.

[2] "The procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered *expressly*, in relation to the Son is *contained virtually* in the Scriptures." Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

proceeding out of (ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ) the throne of God and of the Lamb." And that the "river of water of life" is intended to symbolise the Holy Spirit is shown by the evangelist's comment on the very similar phrase used in the Gospel by our Lord himself. "He that believeth on Me . . . out of his belly shall flow *rivers of living water*. But this spake He *of the Spirit*, which they that believe on Him should receive" (S. John vii. 38, 39). If the "rivers of living water" in the one passage symbolise the Spirit, we can scarcely doubt that the "river of water of life" in the other has the same significance. And, if so, "proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb," forms a complete justification of the language of the creed. But, apart from this text, there is ample proof in Holy Scripture of the doctrine, for the relation of the Spirit towards the Son is habitually set forth in the very same terms that are used of His relation to the Father. Our Lord speaks of the Spirit as "sent" now by Himself, and now by the Father (compare S. John xiv. 26 with xv. 26). So clear is this, that the Greeks have never denied the *mission* of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. Again we find that the Spirit is spoken of sometimes as the "Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 11), or the "Spirit of the Father" (S. Matt. x. 20), sometimes as the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom. viii. 9), the "Spirit of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 19), the "Spirit of God's Son" (Gal. iv. 6). Christ also said of the Spirit "He shall receive of Mine" (S. John xvi. 14), and when He imparted the gift of the Spirit to His apostles after the resurrection He "breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (S. John xx. 22), apparently thus signifying that the Spirit proceeds from Him as the breath from man.

From all these passages, and from the use of similar language elsewhere, it may be gathered that even though

the procession from the Son be not expressly stated in the Scriptures, it may yet be reasonably inferred from them. Only, care must be taken in order to avoid a misunderstanding of the article in the creed. Much of the objection which has been taken to the doctrine of the "double procession" has arisen from the notion that the phrase gives a sort of sanction to the idea of there being two ἀρχαί, or sources of the Godhead, as if the Spirit were said to proceed from the Father and the Son in the same manner. Any such notion is an entire mistake. The Western Church, which alone makes use of the formula, "proceeding from the Father and the Son" has always disclaimed such an interpretation of it, and has been careful to explain that its meaning is precisely the same as that of the formula, which many among the Greeks have been willing to adopt, namely, "proceeding *from* (ἐκ) the Father *through* (διά) the Son." Some words of the late Archdeacon Freeman may be cited here to illustrate this and make it clear.

"It is commonly and widely imagined that there was direct and irreconcilable opposition between East and West; the Greeks holding that the Holy Spirit does not come forth, in any sense, from all eternity from the Son; the Latins, that He comes forth from both in the same sense and way. Whereas Greeks and Latins held alike, that the Spirit came forth from the Son as well as from the Father, only in a different sense and way. Tertullian, who is early enough and central enough to be counted neither Greek nor Latin, in any strict sense, states the whole relation with admirable clearness, so far as human language and earthly types can shadow forth a mystery: 'Tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio; *sicut tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine*: ita Trinitas per connectos gradus a Patri decurrens monarchiæ nihil obstrepit.' The Holy

Land furnishes us with a magnificent illustration of what is meant. Not far from Cæsarea Philippi the primary *spring* of the Jordan rushes forth with great violence, and immediately forms a deep and large *fount*; the largest, probably, says Mr. Tristram, in the world. From this fount or well the Jordan proper flows. It *issues* forth, that is, from the spring, and from that alone, as its primary source; but it proceeds also, in strictest truth, from the fount or well, only *not* as its primary source. In this most real sense the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father and the Son." And the ancient Greek Fathers, while stedfastly maintaining that God the Father is the only original fountain of Deity, did not hesitate (so S. Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, John Damascene) to acknowledge that God the Son, as being eternally consubstantial with the Father, is mediately a fountain (πηγή) of the Holy Spirit; that He flows to us eternally *through* God the Son (δι' αὐτοῦ), although not *out* of Him in the sense in which He does flow out of the Father."[1]

Any illustration is capable of misleading if pressed too far. And this one is no exception to the rule. But if all thought of *time* and *separation* be excluded, the type of the stream is perhaps the best that can be found to shadow forth the heavenly mystery,[2] and will probably convey to the reader's mind the clearest notion of what is intended to be expressed by the clause in the creed which we have been considering.

(*b*) From the explanation of the doctrine we pass to the history of its expression in the creed.

[1] Letter to the *Guardian*, Nov. 6, 1872. The statement in the text about the *ancient* Greeks is strictly true. The modern Greeks, however, appear to hesitate to admit anything more than a temporal mission from the Son.

[2] Πῶς ἐκπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός; ὡς ἀπὸ πηγῆς ὕδωρ. Chrysostom Hom. lxxii. quoted in Suicer's *Thesaurus*, vol. i. p. col. 1069.

The Creed of Nicæa, it will be remembered, contained no statement whatever on the subject of the procession, for it ended abruptly with the words, "And in the Holy Ghost." It has been commonly stated that all the clauses which follow these words were added at the Council of Constantinople, in 381. This, however, is certainly erroneous. The Council cannot have "added" what was there already, and we know that the additional clauses were in existence and had found a place in the creed some years before the Council of Constantinople was held. More will be said on this subject later on, in connection with the Eighth Article. In this place it will be sufficient to point out that the words, "the Lord and Giver of Life, proceeding from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets," are found for the first time in the year 373 or 374, when they are given by Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus*. Whatever be the truth concerning the acceptance of the enlarged creed containing them at Constantinople there is no doubt that it was accepted at Chalcedon in 451, under the impression that it had been previously sanctioned at Constantinople, and henceforward it is known for some centuries as the "Constantinopolitan Creed." But previous to the date of the Council of Chalcedon there is no trace of a knowledge of it—as distinct from the original Nicene Creed—in the West, nor do we find notices of its *use* there for some time to come. In 589, however, was held the famous Third Council of Toledo, at which Spain publicly proclaimed its catholicity. The Visigoths in Spain had up to this time professed an Arian Creed. But now under King Reccared the heresy was renounced, and the Catholic faith was formally accepted. The Council was called by Reccared shortly after his conversion for the purpose of publicly proclaim-

ing the orthodoxy of the Gothic Church in Spain. Accordingly, the assembled bishops, to testify their adhesion to the Catholic faith, recited (1) "the Creed published at the Council of Nicæa" [*i.e.* the original Nicene Creed of 325], and (2) "the holy faith which the hundred and fifty fathers of the Council of Constantinople explained, consonant with the great Council of Nicæa" [*i.e.* the Creed in our Communion service, which is commonly termed Nicene]. But in this latter form, as recited at Toledo, there occur two variations from the true text as current in the Greek Church then and at the present day—(1) The words *Deum de Deo* are inserted. These correspond to the Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ of the original Creed of Nicæa, but they are wanting in the larger Constantinopolitan Creed. (2) *Et Filio* is added in the article on the Holy Ghost after the words *a patre* in the clause *a patre procedentem.* Thus there appears for the first time in a formal creed of the Church the expression which has since been the subject of so much controversy. The question at once arises: To what cause was the addition of the words "And the Son" due? To this it is believed that the only answer that can be returned is that the insertion was *purely accidental*, that is, that it was made without the slightest intention of "adding" anything, and in the full belief that the words formed part of the creed as generally received by the Catholic Church. There was at the time of the Council no controversy whatever on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit,[1] and no good reason has ever been assigned

[1] Some controversy on the subject there had been previously in the far East during the fifth century, when Theodoret had objected to S. Cyril's statement that the Spirit is ἴδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ, saying that it was blasphemy if it meant that the Spirit was ἐξ υἱοῦ ἢ δι' υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον. The Council of Ephesus (431) not only approved Cyril's language, but had also condemned a creed ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, which denied to the Spirit a ὕπαρξις διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ. But the controversy had proceeded no

why the words *Et Filio* should have been of deliberate purpose added to the creed. Moreover, the language of the bishops assembled at Toledo on the decrees of the General Councils, as well as on the Creed the use of which they adopted, is such as to preclude any idea of their having made any conscious alteration of its terms. They anathematise any who believe "that there is any other Catholic faith and communion besides that of the universal Church, that Church, to wit, which holds and honours the decrees of the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, the first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon." Again, after confessing the error of their past belief, they anathematise, among others, those who despise the faith of the Nicene Council, those who say "that the faith of the hundred and fifty bishops of the Council of Constantinople is not true," and those who do not receive "all the Councils of orthodox bishops consonant to the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, the first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon." After which they proceed as follows: "The constitutions of the holy Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which we have heard with well-pleased ear, and have approved as true by our confession, we have subscribed with our whole heart and our whole soul and our whole mind: *thinking that nothing can be more lucid for the knowledge of the truth than what the authorities of the aforesaid Councils contain. Of the Trinity and the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, nothing can ever be shown to be clearer or more lucid than these.*"

And as if this was not sufficient, they order that in future, "for reverence of the most holy faith, and for the strengthening of the weak minds of men . . . throughout all the churches of Spain and Galicia, the

further, and it is quite impossible that the assertion of the double procession at Toledo in 589 can have had the slightest connection with it.

symbol of faith of the Council of Constantinople, *i.e.* of the hundred and fifty bishops, should be recited, *according to the form of the Eastern Church.*"

In the face of these very precise and definite statements it appears inconceivable that they could have set themselves deliberately to make material alteration in the form of one article of the creed, and, as Dr. Pusey says, "the only solution seems to be that the Spanish bishops knew of no other expression of doctrine, and that accordingly it [*i.e.* the *Filioque* clause] had in some way found its way into their Latin translation of the creed. For the liturgical use of the creed, which by the multiplication of copies and its universal use, made variation impossible, dated from this Council."[1]

There is really no sort of difficulty in this supposition. The creed is so familiar to us, its exact words are so jealously guarded, and copies of it are so numerous, that it is hard to throw ourselves back into the position of the Spanish bishops to whom, as coming over from Arianism, the form was probably novel. But the ease with which such an insertion might be made is shown by the parallel case of the clause *Deum de Deo.* This was evidently the result of accident. But the clause has since then been adopted universally by the Western Church, although it is still wanting in the form of the Constantinopolitan Creed in use in the East. Nor must it be forgotten that the whole Catholic Church of the West, at least since the days of Augustine, had been accustomed to speak of the Holy Ghost as "proceeding from the Father and the Son."[2] More particularly was the phrase a familiar one

[1] "Letter to the Rev. H. P. Liddon on the clause 'And the Son,' p. 49, where much information will be found on the Council of Toledo. Compare also Mansi, ix. p. 977, and Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, p. 158 *seq.*

[2] The double procession had been asserted by Western writers even before Augustine. Hilary of Poictiers had spoken of the Spirit as *ex Patre*

to the orthodox in Spain, since it had been definitely adopted in a profession of faith set forth at a previous Council held at Toledo, under the influence of Leo the Great, in 447. "We believe"—so runs the "rule of the Catholic Faith against all heresies, and especially against the Priscillianists"—"in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one Trinity of Divine Essence . . . The Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but *proceeding from the Father and the Son.* The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Paraclete *proceeding from the Father and the Son.*"[1] Thus the doctrine of the double procession would appear to those who had but just abjured the Arian heresy as an acknowledged part of that Catholic faith to which they had given in their adherence. They would naturally give expression to it, and when the creed was translated into Latin for their use, the translator would almost inevitably insert it either by inadvertence, not noticing its absence from the Greek, or else in perfect simplicity and good faith, believing that it *ought* to be in the creed, and that its omission from his copy must have been an accident.[2] Anyhow *there* the phrase is for the

per Filium (*De Trinit.* xii. 55, 57). S. Ambrose had said that the Spirit proceeds from (*ex*) the Son, as well as from the Father; though he apparently intended by this the *temporal* mission as distinct from the *eternal* procession. (See Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, i. 11). Augustine, however, is very clear on the subject (see especially *De Trinitate* xv. 47): "Filius de Patre natus est, et Spiritus Sanctus de Patre principaliter, et, ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante, communiter de utroque procedit." Other passages from Augustine may be seen in Pusey ("On the Clause, 'And the Son'"), p. 142 *seq.*, and earlier in the same work (pp. 53–59) quotations are given from a number of other Western writers, previous to Toledo, who had given expression to the doctrine, *e.g.* Eucherius of Lyons (434), S. Leo the Great (440), Vigilius, Fulgentius, and others. Compare also Swete's *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, ch. vii.

[1] See *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 129, and cf. Hahn, p. 130. The profession has been assigned to the year 400. It is now generally believed to belong to the Council of 447.

[2] Dr. Pusey writes as follows: "It seems to me morally certain that

first time in the creed, and there it has remained ever since, although it only made its way gradually from Spain into the other churches of Western Christendom. It is most remarkable how long the addition remained unnoticed. During the seventh century there are one or two faint murmurs of controversy between Easterns and Westerns, concerning the *doctrine* of the procession,[1] but no hint is given that the interpolation of the creed in Spain has been discovered. In the Lateran Council of A.D. 649 the Constantinopolitan Creed was recited without the *Filioque*, as it was also at the Sixth General Council at Constantinople in 680; although curiously enough, we find that the year before this the doctrine of the double procession had been distinctly asserted at our own English Council of Hatfield, held under Archbishop Theodore, a fact which is all the more remarkable, as Theodore, who was himself a Greek from Tarsus, seems to have accepted it without the slightest difficulty.[2] After this we hear of nothing further which bears upon the subject until the latter half of the eighth

whoever inserted it supposed that the *Filioque* had dropped by mistake out of the Latin translation of the Nicene Creed, to which alone they probably had access in Spain at that time. Anyone in the least familiar with the collation of MSS., will be aware of this cause of change in the text of a Father, that a scribe, *bona fide*, inserts what he thinks has been accidentally omitted. Thus, when the whole context relates to some contrast between the Father and the Son, a scribe will insert '*et Spiritu Sancto*' to complete the confession of the Trinity; the insertion has sometimes found its way into the printed text. In like way, I doubt not, the *Filioque* came into the translation, which was before the bishops of the third Council of Toledo, under a misapprehension that it *must* be there."—*Op. cit.* p. 64.

[1] See Swete, *History*, etc. p. 183.

[2] See Bæda, *H. E.* IV. xvii.: "Glorificantes Deum Patrem sine initio et Filium ejus unigenitum et Patre generatum ante sæcula, et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter, sicut prædicaverunt hi quos memoravimus supra, sancti apostoli et prophetæ et doctores." Whether the interpolated creed was already accepted in this country is a matter on which we have no evidence whatever.

century, and even then the question is only with regard to the *doctrine*, and no notice is taken of the interpolation of the creed. In A.D. 767 a Council (of which the records have perished) was held at Gentilly, near Paris; and at this, according to a writer of the following century, Ado of Vienne (†874), the question was discussed between the Greeks and Romans concerning the Trinity, and whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son in the same way as He proceeds from the Father (utrum Spiritus Sanctus sicut procedit a Patre ita procedit a Filio). This notice, however, stands by itself, and of the details of the discussion we have no knowledge. Twenty years later (A.D. 787) was held a great Council at Nicæa in connection with the Iconoclastic Controversy. At the third session of the Council a letter was read from Tarasius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, containing the words, "I believe . . . . in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father through the Son."[1] This, which had been previously approved by the Pope Hadrian, was formally accepted by the Council, which was closed by the recitation of the *uninterpolated* Constantinopolitan Creed. The proceedings of the Council were then communicated to the West. With Rome there was no difficulty. Not so with Gaul, and under the influence of Charlemagne, a capitular was sent to Rome objecting strongly to various statements made or permitted by the Council, and among other matters calling attention to the doctrine of Tarasius upon the procession, and pointing out that it was not in agreement with the Nicene Creed,[2] by which is

[1] *πιστεύω . . . εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δὶ υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον.*—Swete, p. 206; Mansi, xii. 122.

[2] "Quod Tarasius non recte sentiat qui Spiritum Sanctum non ex Patre et Filio Secundum Nicenum Symbolum, sed ex Patre per Filium procedentem in suæ credulitatis lectione profiteatur."—*Migne*, vol. xcviii. p. 1257.

evidently intended the Constantinopolitan Creed, which Charles only knew with the interpolated clause, *Filioque*. This is the first indication that we have that the interpolation has spread from Spain. The Franks, we thus discover, were already using the creed with the *Filioque* clause, and since about this time the creed appears, also under the influence of Charles, to have been adopted in the liturgy of the Gallican Church, its use rapidly spread.[1] Hadrian, in his reply to the capitular, contents himself with defending the doctrinal orthodoxy of the statements of Tarasius, but does not touch on the question of the clause in the Creed. This was not enough for Charles, and we find the doctrine of the double procession strongly affirmed by the third of the Caroline books,[2] and also by the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), at which Charles brought together bishops from Italy, Gaul, Aquitaine, and Britain. Two years later at Friuli (A.D. 796) "the interpolation of the creed was for the first time openly defended before a Synod of the Church."[3] The Council, however, was merely a provincial one of the suffragans of Aquileia, by whom the doctrine and the interpolation of the creed was accepted without difficulty, and as yet, although the clause has been adopted by the whole Western Church except Rome, the Easterns have apparently not discovered the fact. It came out, however, early in the next century. In A.D. 809 Charles assembled a Council at Aachen, for the express purpose of considering the doctrine of the procession. This was rendered necessary by a dispute which had arisen at Jerusalem between the Greeks and a colony of Latin monks residing there. The former accused the latter of heresy, alleging among other matters, that they chanted the creed with *Filioque*. The Latin monks appealed to the Pope, Leo III., urging

[1] See Walafrid Strabo, *De rebus Eccles.* ch. 21.

[2] *Migne*, vol. xcviii.

[3] Swete, *History*, etc., p. 213.

in justification of their practice — (1) that the creed as sung in the Emperor's chapel contained the clause in question; (2) that it was also contained in the *fides Athanasii*, as well as in books which they had received from the Emperor. The reply of the Pope to this appeal is lost, but there is still extant a profession of faith sent by him to the East, containing no allusion to the interpolation of the creed, but strongly asserting the *doctrine* of the double procession. Shortly after this the above mentioned Council was held at Aachen. At this, as might have been expected, the doctrine was steadily maintained by the Franks, and legates were appointed to confer with the Pope concerning the interpolation of the creed. To the doctrine as asserted by the Council Leo readily agreed. Indeed he denounced the wilful rejection of the belief of the Western Church on this subject as heresy. But when he came to discuss with the legates the interpolation of the creed he drew back, and steadily refused to admit the clause. The Roman Church had never received it, and he could not consent to it. The legates urged that if it was now cut out of the creed used in the mass, the doctrine would naturally be thought to be erroneous. With the words the truth itself would be lost. Leo admitted the danger, and in order to avoid it advised the discontinuance of the custom of chanting the creed in the mass. It was not so used at Rome; why should it be in Gaul? If its public use was thus dropped, then after a time the excision might be made without danger, and the correct text of the creed restored. Of this advice Charles appears to have taken no notice whatever. The use of the creed was certainly not discontinued by the Franks, nor was the excision of the clause made. But so resolute was the Pope to guard against the unauthorised addition in his own Church that "for the love which he bore to the orthodox faith, and

out of his care for its preservation" he caused two silver shields to be made, on which was engraved the creed in Latin and in Greek; and these were set up on either side of the confession in S. Peter's. This plan appears to have succeeded for a time, and "it has been thought that the interpolated symbol obtained no recognised footing at Rome until, exactly two hundred years after the death of Charlemagne, the Emperor Henry II. prevailed upon Benedict VIII. (A.D. 1014), to adopt the German use of chanting the symbol at the holy mysteries."[1] It was, however, long before this that the controversy which led to the final schism between East and West had broken out, and among the subjects of dispute the interpolation of the creed occupied a prominent position, although by no means the only matter of controversy, nor indeed the real cause of the schism.

This brief sketch of the history will serve to show—(1) how the doctrine of the double procession has always been held by the Latins, and (2) how the interpolated creed gradually made its way from Spain till it was accepted in every part of the Western Church. Into the history of the dispute between the East and West, which originated in the quarrels of Photius of Constantinople with Pope Nicholas the First, it is unnecessary to enter here. But something must be said, in conclusion, on the objections which have been raised in both ancient and modern times to the insertion of the additional phrase, "And the Son" in the creed.

(1) The principal objection raised by Photius (A.D. 850) was that it implied the existence of two sources (ἀρχαί) of divinity, and thus destroyed the unity of the Godhead.

To this it is replied that such an interpretation of the phrase has always been rejected by the Westerns, who have consistently maintained that it is intended to

[1] Swete, p. 225.

express the very same doctrine taught by the formula "from the Father through the Son," which, as has been already shown, many Greeks have been willing to admit.

(2) A second objection sometimes raised is, that it is contrary to the seventh canon of the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), which, we are told, forbade any addition to be made to the creed in future.

An obvious answer to this is, that if the canon in question forbids the words "and the Son," it equally forbids "proceeding from the Father," because the only creed recognised at Ephesus was the original creed of Nicæa, which ended with the words "and in the Holy Ghost." Both parts of the following clause, "proceeding from the Father and the Son," are equally "additions" to this, and therefore both fall equally under the condemnation of the canon, if it was really intended to forbid any addition to be made to the creed. But a reference to the terms of the canon, and the circumstances under which it was drawn up, is enough to render this interpretation of it extremely questionable. The circumstances were these: A Nestorian Creed, attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, had been pressed upon some Christians of the East, and Charisius, a presbyter of Philadelphia, who had refused to accept it, had been excommunicated in consequence. He now appealed to the Council against his excommunicators. The Nestorian Creed was produced and read before the assembled Fathers, as well as the original Creed of Nicæa, after which the canon in question was passed. It runs as follows:—

"These things having been read [namely, the two creeds, the heretical Nestorian and the orthodox Nicene], the holy Synod has determined that no person shall be allowed to bring forward or to write or to compose another creed beside that defined by the holy Fathers who were assembled at the city of Nicæa with the Holy Spirit

(ἑτέραν πίστιν . . . παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν κ.τ.λ). But those who shall dare to compose any other creed (ἑτέραν πίστιν), or to exhibit or to produce any such to those who wish to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatever, if they are bishops or clergy, shall be deposed, the bishops from the episcopate, the clergy from their office (ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου), but if they are of the laity, they shall be anathematised. In like manner if any, whether bishops or clergy, shall be discovered either holding or teaching the things contained in the exposition (ἐκθέσις) exhibited by the presbyter Charisius concerning the Incarnation of the only begotten Son of God, or the impious and profane doctrines of Nestorius, which have been put down, let them be subject to the sentence of this most holy and Œcumenical Synod; so that if it be a bishop who does so, he shall be removed from his bishopric and be deposed: and in like manner, if he belong to the clergy, he shall forfeit his clerical rank; but if he be a layman, he shall be anathematised, as has been before said."

From this two things are clear—*first*, that the canon simply refers to the private action on the part of *individuals*. It forbids any *person* to bring forward another creed. It was not intended to refer to any possible action of the Church in future, or to bind it for all time to make no addition to the terms of the creed. Indeed, *secondly*, it is clear that the object of the canon was simply to prohibit the substitution of a different, that is, a heretical creed for the Nicene. It was with a definite reference to the attempt to force a Nestorian Creed on some Christians that the canon was passed, and it may safely be said that the thought of forbidding any addition to be made to the Nicene Creed in future cannot possibly

have been present to the minds of those who are responsible for it. It does not touch the case of the *Filioque* clause at all, and it is to be hoped that we have heard the last of this objection, which was due to an entire misconception of the terms and purpose of the canon, but which has been raised not only to the addition to the Constantinopolitan Creed, but also to the use made by the English Church of the (so-called) Athanasian Creed.

(3) One more objection remains. It may be urged that the clause was inserted in the creed irregularly, without any proper ecclesiastical authority, and that it is beyond the competence of any one branch of the Church to add in this manner to a creed of the universal Church.

There is some force in this objection, and considerable weight might be attached to it, had the clause been in the first instance an *intentional* addition, though even so, its insertion might plausibly be defended by the treatment which the original Nicene Creed received after its acceptance by the whole Church at Nicæa. Local branches of the Church certainly *did* add to it without incurring censure, or having fault found with their action, for additional clauses on the Incarnation, as well as those in the latter part of the creed, were current for a considerable time before they could claim any proper and regular ecclesiastical sanction,[1] and any objection to the *Filioque* on the score of irregularity would at one time have equally applied to them. But in the case of the *Filioque* the objection is still more effectually removed by the further consideration that the "addition" was *unintentional,* and that it was not discovered to be an addition, nor called in question for more than two centuries after the Council of Toledo, to which it has

[1] See below on Article VIII. p. 320.

been traced. The Western Church does not seem ever to have made any public use—at least on a wide scale—of the creed without the clause; and to have omitted it at a comparatively late date would have looked very much like a repudiation of the doctrine contained in it. The clause, when rightly understood, as has been already shown, expresses a real truth of Scripture, which the Western Church had been for centuries accustomed to teach in the formula now found in the creed. It was impossible for her to alter the form which she publicly used without thereby endangering the doctrine. It was clearly an act of unwarrantable tyranny on the part of the Latins to attempt to force the acceptance of the clause on the Greeks, as was actually done by Pope Nicholas III. (A.D. 1277).[1] The Greeks had never received it, and were accustomed to express the doctrine by a different formula. To *them* its adoption would have seemed a change of doctrine in the direction of heresy. But it is too much to ask the Latins to give up the use of the clause, since they would thereby practically disown the doctrine which it contains. A parallel case is afforded by the difficulty connected with the word hypostasis in the fourth century, and the treatment which this received at the Council of Alexandria indicates the proper solution of the difficulty connected with the varying forms of the creed in the East and the West. There was a difference of phraseology between different portions of the Church as regards an important matter of faith. But so soon as it was discovered that, in spite of varying language, the meaning of both parties was identical, it was felt that a difference of phraseology was, after all, but a minor inconvenience, which might well be endured without causing any schism in the Church, and it was agreed that both parties might keep to their own traditional mode of

[1] See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi. p. 412.

expressing the doctrine which they both held in common. So also, if Greeks and Latins are really at one in the doctrine, it is possible to look forward to the day when similar wise counsels may prevail, and the acceptance of the Constantinopolitan Creed, either with or without the *Filioque*, may be admitted as a basis for intercommunion between the long-estranged branches of the Church in the East and West.

ARTICLE VI

De Divinis Scripturis, quod Sufficiunt ad Salutem.

Scriptura sacra continet omnia quæ ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur.

Sacræ Scripturæ nomine eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

De nominibus et numero librorum Sacræ Canonicæ Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation.

In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the names and number of the canonical books.

Genesis.	Prior Liber Paralipom.	Genesis.	The First Book of Chronicles.
Exodus.	Secundus Liber Paralipom.	Exodus.	The Second Book of Chronicles.
Leviticus.	Primus Liber Esdræ.	Leviticus.	The First Book of Esdras.
Numeri.	Secundus Liber Esdræ.	Numbers.	The Second Book of Esdras.
Deuteron.	Liber Hester.	Deuteronomy.	The Book of Esther.
Josue.	Liber Job.	Joshua.	The Book of Job.
Judicum.	Psalmi.	Judges.	The Psalms.
Ruth.	Proverbia.	Ruth.	The Proverbs.
Prior Liber Samuelis.	Ecclesiastes vel Concionator.	The First Book of Samuel.	Ecclesiastes or the Preacher.
Secundus Liber Samuelis.	Cantica Salomonis.	The Second Book of Samuel.	Cantica or Songs of Solomon.
Prior Liber Regum.	IV Prophetæ Majores.	The First Book of Kings.	Four Prophets the Greater.
Secundus Liber Regum.	XII Prophetæ Majores.	The Second Book of Kings.	Twelve Prophets the Less.

Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia ad exempla vitæ et formandos mores, illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet: ut sunt

And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:—

Tertius Liber Esdræ.	Baruch Propheta	The Third Book of Esdras.	Baruch the Prophet.
Quartus Liber Esdræ.	Canticum trium Puerorum.	The Fourth Book of Esdras.	The Song of the Three Children.
Liber Tobiæ.	Historia Susannæ.	The Book of Tobias.	The Story of Susanna.
Liber Judith.	De Bel et Dracone.	The Book of Judith.	Of Bel and the Dragon.
Reliquum Libri Hester.	Oratio Manasses.	The rest of the Book of Esther.	The Prayer of Manasses.
Liber Sapientiæ.	Prior Liber Machabæorum.	The Book of Wisdom.	The First Book of Maccabees.
Liber Jesu filii Sirach.	Secundus Liber Machabæorum.	Jesus the Son of Sirach.	The Second Book of Maccabees.

Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus, et habemus pro Canonicos.

All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them for canonical.

The original article of 1553 contained only the *first* paragraph of our present one, and that in a slightly different form: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, *although it be some time received of the faithful as godly, and profitable for an order and comeliness*: yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an article of faith or repute it requisite to the necessity of salvation." The words in italics were omitted in 1563, and the language of the following sentence slightly changed. At the same time Archbishop Parker added the remaining part of the article, with the exception of the *complete* list of the books of the Apocrypha, which was only added at the final revision in 1571, when the present title was

prefixed, and one or two trifling verbal changes introduced into the article itself.[1]

Very similar language to that employed in the first paragraph of the article is found in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after a list of the canonical books of both Testaments, we read as follows: "Hæc igitur generatim est sancta Scriptura, qua omnia creditu ad salutem necessaria, plene et perfecte contineri credimus, usque adeo ut quicquid in ea non legitur nec reperitur, nec denique ex eadem aut consequitur, aut convincitur, a nemine sit exigendum ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur."[2]

The wording of the second paragraph on the canonical books is traced entirely to the Confession of Würtemburg, while that on "the other books" follows very closely the statement of St. Jerome to which it expressly refers us:

"Sicut ergo Judith, et Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recepit: sic et hæc duo volumina [*sc.* Ecclesiasticus et Sapientia] legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam."[3]

The object of this article is to state the exact position taken up by the Church of England with regard to the *use* and *extent* of Holy Scripture, in the face of two opposite errors which she was called upon in the sixteenth century to oppose.

1. The opinion of some among the Anabaptists or "Anti-book religionists," who were described in the

[1] The only books of the Apocrypha mentioned in 1563 were 3 and 4 Esdras, Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees. In 1553 and 1563 the title was, *Divinæ Scripturæ doctrina sufficit ad salutem*—"The doctrine of Holy Scripture is sufficient to salvation."

[2] *De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, ch. ix.

[3] Prologus in *Libros Salom.*

Nineteenth Article of 1553 as those who "affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learnt such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."[1]

2. The teaching of the Church of Rome, which places tradition on a level with Holy Scripture as a source of doctrine, and regards as canonical all those books which the Church of England relegates to an inferior position in the Apocrypha, with the exception of the Third and Fourth Books of Esdras,[2] and the Prayer of Manasses.

The principal subjects which require consideration in connection with this article are the following:—

1. The position of Holy Scripture as the sole source of necessary doctrine.
2. The canon of Scripture.
3. The position of "the other books."

I. *The Position of Holy Scripture as the Sole Source of Necessary Doctrine.*

On this subject the statement of the article is, so far as it goes, clear enough. **Holy Scripture**

[1] To much the same effect we read in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*: "In quo genere teterrimi illi sunt (itaque a nobis primum nominabuntur) qui sacras Scripturas ad infirmorum tantum hominum debilitatem ablegant et detrudunt, sibi sic ipsi interim præfidentes, ut earum authoritate se teneri non putent, sed peculiarem quendam spiritum jactant, a quo sibi omnia suppeditari aiunt, quæcunque docent et faciunt."—*De Hæres.* ch. iii.

[2] Or, as they are called in our Bibles "the First and Second Books of Esdras." The titles given to the books in the Sixth Article are mainly drawn from the Vulgate, in which Ezra and Nehemiah appear as the "First and Second Books of Esdras," and the apocryphal books are consequently enumerated as the "Third and Fourth." In our English Bibles the titles are drawn from the Hebrew, and so Ezra and Nehemiah appear under their own names, and consequently the apocryphal books of Esdras become the "First and Second."

contains all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation. The meaning of this statement is perfectly plain. It "only implies the historical fact that the same body of saving truths which the apostles first preached orally, they afterwards, under the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, wrote in Holy Scripture, God ordering in His providence that, in the unsystematic teaching of Holy Scripture, all should be embodied which is essential to establish the faith."[1] It equally condemns any theory which would regard Holy Scripture as given "only to the weak," and as unnecessary for the "enlightened Christian," and, on the other hand, any view which would base necessary doctrine not ultimately on the written word, but on the traditions or teaching of the Church.

The statements of the article may be illustrated from the promise required from all the clergy before their ordination to the priesthood.

The bishop.—Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Answer.—I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

The statement of the article, like the question addressed to the clergy, refers only to *necessary* doctrine; and it will

[1] Pusey, *The Truth and Office of the English Church*, p. 40.

be noticed that the article is absolutely silent on the question who is to decide what may be proved from Holy Scripture, and fails to state with whom the power resides to enforce *anything* to be believed as an article of faith. For the teaching of the Church of England on these very important subjects we must turn to Article XX., where we are expressly told that 'the Church . . . hath authority in controversies of faith,' and where it is evidently implied that it rests with the Church to decide what may be proved from Scripture, and thus be required to be believed as an article of faith. The consideration of this subject is therefore postponed, and will be taken later on in connection with Article XX. It will be sufficient here to have thus reminded the reader that the teaching of this Sixth Article requires to be supplemented by the later one, if the position taken up by the Church of England is to be properly understood and appreciated.

The subject of the authority to be assigned to the Holy Scriptures was considered by the Church of Rome at the fourth session of the Council of Trent, which was held in April 1546, some years before the Anglican Articles were drawn up. The decree was, therefore, before the compilers of the Edwardian as well as the Elizabethan series. It runs as follows:—

"The sacred and holy Œcumenical and General Synod of Trent . . . keeping this always in view that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the gospel should be preserved in the Church, which (gospel) before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth and then commanded to be preached by His apostles to every creature, as the fountain both of every saving truth and also of the discipline of morals; and perceiving that *this truth and discipline is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions* which,

received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the Synod) following the example of the orthodox Fathers, *receives and venerates, with equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and also of the New Testament*—seeing that one God is the author of both—*as also the said traditions, both those appertaining to faith as well as those appertaining to morals,* as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic Church."[1]

The terms of this decree are not altogether free from ambiguity, for the assertion that the "truth and discipline are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions" is capable of bearing two widely different interpretations. It may be taken to mean that the whole faith is contained in the Scriptures, and is also taught by tradition; and if it be taken in this way, there is nothing in it to which any Anglican need take exception. But, on the other hand, it may mean that Scripture alone is the source of some part of the faith, and tradi-

[1] "Sacrosancta Œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus . . . hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur; quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis Sanctis Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit; deinde per suos Apostolos, tanquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinæ, omni creaturæ prædicari jussit; perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."—*Conc. Trident. Sessio Quarta. Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.*

tion alone the source of some other part, and this, of course, is a position to which an Anglican could by no means subscribe. This ambiguity is not altogether removed when we turn from the decree of Trent to the writings of representative divines of the Roman communion, for while Cardinal Wiseman asserts that "there is no other groundwork whatever for faith except the written word of God,"[1] and Cardinal Newman uses language to much the same effect;[2] on the other hand, Moehler tells us that "it is asserted by the Catholic Church that many things have been delivered to her by the apostles which Holy Writ either does not at all comprise or at most only alludes to,"[3] and Perrone is equally emphatic in laying down that there are some dogmatic traditions which are *a Scriptura plane distinctæ*, as well as those explanatory and interpretative traditions which he calls *inhæsivæ et declarativæ*.[4] These quotations may serve to show the real difficulty that there is in stating precisely what the Church of Rome stands committed to. But we shall not probably be wrong if we assert that though the majority of Roman divines would welcome support and illustration from Scripture for all articles of faith, including the most recent developments, namely, the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, and that of the papal infallibility, yet they would make the basis on which these doctrines rest the teaching of the Church. Anglicans, on the other hand, while always looking for support and illustration from "hermeneutical tradition," maintain that in the last resort Scripture is the sole source of the faith. The Church of England has most certainly never

[1] *Lectures*, ch. iii. p. 60.

[2] "Letter to Dr. Pusey on the *Eirenicon*," p. 14, quoted in Bp. Forbes on the *Articles*, p. 97. Cf. *Development*, ch. vii. 1, sec. 4.

[3] *Symbolism*, p. 286. (Ed. 1). [4] *Prælectiones*, vol. ii., p. 148 *seq.*

underrated the importance of the appeal to antiquity. The very same canon of the Convocation of 1571, which imposes subscription to the Articles on the clergy, requires all preachers to "see that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from the same doctrine."[1] But it is one thing to use tradition as a help towards arriving at the true sense of Scripture, and quite another thing to make it a source of Christian doctrine. All the articles of faith are not expressly set down in Scripture in so many words, but there can be no hesitation in asserting that they "may be proved thereby." This, however, immediately opens out the question, How are we to know in what sense the words of Scripture are to be understood? And here, without anticipating what must be said on this subject under the Twentieth Article, it may be pointed out that the value of tradition, where it can be ascertained, is enormous, as showing how the words of Scripture have ever been understood by the Church. So much it seemed necessary to say here, in order to make it clear that the Sixth Article is not meant in any way to cast a slight upon tradition and the appeal to antiquity. It is only designed to protect jealously the rightful position of the Scriptures, as containing, though in an informal way, the "faith once for all delivered to the saints,"[2] and to guard against any additions or accretions to the original deposit committed to the care of the Catholic Church.

[1] The Canon *Concionatores.* "Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici patres, et veteres Episcopi collegerunt."—Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. i. p. 126.

[2] S. Jude, ver. 3, *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.*

We have next to consider the arguments in favour of the position thus maintained in the article.

(*a*) And, first, *how far can it be proved from Scripture?* It must be confessed that the texts which are sometimes quoted in support of the "sufficiency of Holy Scripture" are in themselves extremely inconclusive, *e.g.* "the law of the Lord is perfect" (Ps. xix. 7); "the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. iii. 15); "if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book" (Rev. xxii. 18). Of these passages the first, if it were (as it manifestly is not) capable of being used as formal proof, would prove too much, for "the law," if taken of the written word, could not be strained to mean more than the Pentateuch. The second obviously refers only to the Old Testament, with which alone Timothy could have been familiar from his childhood; while the third has no reference to any portion of Holy Scripture, except the Apocalypse, to which it is appended. It will be wise, therefore, not to rely on isolated and detached passages in endeavouring to establish the statement of the article, but to be content with an indirect rather than a direct scriptural proof. That Holy Scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation" is nowhere laid down directly in the Bible, but it appears to be a fair and reasonable inference from the general teaching of Scripture with regard to the final character of the revelation made in the New Testament, as well as from the fact that the Scriptures were in the providence of God committed to writing.

There are frequent indications in Scripture that the written law has a *security* which is wanting in the case of oral tradition. S. Luke's Gospel was written expressly in order that Theophilus might know *the certainty* of the things in which he had previously been orally instructed

(S. Luke i. 4). S. John's Gospel was also written for Christians who must have received much oral teaching, and yet he gives this as his reason for writing: "That ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name" (S. John xx. 31).

Again, the severity with which our Lord denounces the Jews for "making the word of God of none effect through their traditions," and the way in which He sets aside the accretions which they had allowed to grow up around the written law (see especially S. Mark vii. 1–13) supply us with a warning against trusting to oral tradition; while, on the other hand, the constant habit of our Lord Himself, and His apostles after Him, of appealing to the written Scriptures of the Old Covenant, using these as "proof," and commending those who "searched" them (*e.g.* the Berœans, Acts xvii. 11), leads us to conclude that, in the absence of express statement to the contrary, the same method is to be followed, now that there is committed to the care of the Church a "New Testament" corresponding to the Old.

That the revelation made in Christ was final is assumed throughout the New Testament. Had it not been so, it is hard to understand how the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews could have written the opening verses of his epistle as he did (Heb. i. 1–3), or how S. Jude could have employed the striking phrase already quoted, and have spoken of "the faith" as "*once for all* committed to the saints" (ver. 3). No writer of the New Testament ever gives us the slightest ground for looking for any further revelation. And if the final revelation was made in Christ, and the Scriptures were written for the purpose of preserving an authentic record of that revelation, it seems impossible to believe that any necessary doctrine can be omitted from them. It

has been pertinently remarked, in illustration of this, that "if a legislator desires to commit his laws to writing, in order that an authentic record of them may remain to all future times, it is not to be supposed that he will omit a portion of them. He will indeed provide some mode of interpreting and executing those laws, but he will not designedly leave any portion of them out of the record." [1]

(*b*) Thus the teaching of the article rests ultimately on the Scriptures themselves. But in support of it an appeal may safely be made to *the general consent of Christians and the authority of the Fathers.* That the Fathers appeal freely to tradition is undeniable, but it will be found that their appeals to it are of two kinds—(1) referring to matters of custom and ritual, where they appeal to it precisely as an Anglican would do, independently of Scripture, and (2) referring to *doctrine*, where they appeal to it not as teaching truths which are nowhere contained in Scripture, but as illustrating and determining the sense of Scripture.[2] While on the other hand, they constantly appeal to Scripture in such a way as to show that they regarded it as the sole ultimate source of all necessary doctrine.

Catenæ of passages from patristic writings, asserting the sufficiency of the Scriptures have been so frequently compiled, and are so easily accessible, that it is not pro-

[1] Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i.

[2] In the passages of Irenæus and Tertullian referring to the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, or *regula fidei*, the allusion is not to any authority independent of Scripture, but to the Creed, which summarises the principal doctrines of Scripture (see Irenæus, I. i. III. ii–iv; Tertullian, *De Præscript.* xiii. xiv.), while the famous passage, in which Tertullian rhetorically maintains that "no appeal must be made to the Scriptures, on them no contest should be instituted," is easily explained by the fact that he was writing against heretics who perverted the Scriptures, nor does it in any way imply that tradition handed down matters of faith not contained in the Scriptures.—See *Præscript.* xix.

posed to add another to the number here. Reference is made in the footnote to standard works on the subject,[1] and it will accordingly be sufficient here to quote but two passages from representative writers of the East and West, and to add to them a striking passage from a third writer of repute, which admirably sets forth the true relation of tradition to Scripture.

Of the views of the Eastern Fathers S. Athanasius (*c.* A.D. 318) may be taken as the exponent, and he tells us distinctly that "the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves to the declaration of the truth."[2] For the West no better spokesman can be found than S. Augustine (A.D. 430). In his work *On Nature and Grace* he is compelled to reply to objections to his teaching drawn by Pelagius from quotations out of "certain treatises of Catholic writers," and in answer to this he says boldly that in writings of such authors he feels himself free to use his own judgment, "*owing unhesitating assent to nothing but the canonical Scriptures.*"[3] The third quotation shall be drawn from the writings of S. Vincent of Lerins (A.D. 450), himself the author of the famous canon of truth, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*

At the beginning of his *Commonitorium* he writes as follows: "Inquiring often with great earnestness and attention of very many excellent, holy, and learned men, how and by what means I might assuredly, and as it

[1] Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. ii. Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*, pt. ii. bk. i. § 2. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i. Browne on the *Articles*, p. 140 *seq.*; and cf. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 60.

[2] *Adv. Gentes*, § 1: Αὐτάρκεις μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἅγιαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γράφαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.

[3] *De Natura et Gratia*, ch. lxi: "Maxime quoniam me, in hujusmodi quorum libet hominum scriptis liberum (quia solis Canonicis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensum) nihil movet quod de illius scriptis, cujus nomen non ibi inveni, ille posuit," etc.

were by some general and regular way, discern the true Catholic faith from false and wicked heresy, to this question I had usually received this answer from them all, namely, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics daily springing up, and to escape their snares, and willingly would continue in a sound faith, himself safe and sound, he ought in two ways by God's assistance to defend and preserve his faith, namely, *by the authority of the law of God*, and secondly, *by the tradition of the Catholic Church.*

"Here some one, perhaps, may ask, seeing the canon of Scripture is perfect, and of itself most abundantly sufficient for all things, what need is there to join to it the authority of the ecclesiastical interpretation? The reason is this, that the Scripture being of itself so deep and profound, all men do not understand it in one and the same sense, but divers men diversely, this man and that man, this way and that way, expound and interpret the sayings thereof, so that to one's thinking, so many men, so many opinions almost may be gathered out of it . . . and therefore it is most necessary, because of the vagaries of errors so various, that the line of expounding the prophets and apostles be drawn according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and Catholic sense."[1]

Again, at the end of the same treatise he sums up its teaching: "We said above that this has always been, and even at this day is, the custom of Catholics to try and examine the true faith by these two methods: first, by the authority of the divine canon; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church; not because the canonical Scripture is not as to itself sufficient for all things, but because very many, expounding God's word at their own will, do thereby conceive divers opinions and errors. And for this cause it is necessary that the

[1] *Commonitorium*, ch. ii.

interpretation of the heavenly Scripture be directed according to the one only rule of the Church's understanding; only, be it observed, especially in those questions upon which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine depend."[1]

These two arguments—(*a*) the general teaching of Scripture, its nature and end, and (*b*) the general consent of the Church and the authority of the Fathers are, it is believed, fully sufficient, when carefully considered and weighed, to establish the truth of the statement made in the first part of the article, that "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation." A few words may, however, be added on the argument, sometimes alleged, that Scripture proves its own insufficiency by its statements in the following passages:[2]

2 Thess. ii. 15: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions (*παραδόσεις*, Vulg. *traditiones*) which ye have been taught whether by word or our epistle."

1 Tim. vi. 20.: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust" (*τὴν παραθήκην*).

2 Tim. i. 13: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me."

Acts i. 3: "Christ showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

[1] *Commonitorium*, ch. xxix.

[2] Other arguments such as these, that "tradition was the original rule," and that "Scripture is obscure and liable to be misunderstood," are plainly beside the mark when the Anglican position is rightly understood. Answers to them may, however, be found in Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii. ch. i., and Browne on the *Articles*, p. 136 *seq.*

St. John xxi. 25: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

In answer to the argument drawn from the occurrence of these passages in the New Testament it may be observed that the last two cited might equally well be urged on behalf of the insufficiency of tradition; since no one has ever pretended that tradition has handed down every word which our Lord uttered, or even all that He uttered during the great forty days. The passages, however, plainly do not touch the question whether the whole of revealed truth necessary to salvation has or has not been committed to writing.

With regard to the passages from the epistles, it is sufficient to point out that the short epistle in which the first of them occurs, certainly does not contain the whole truth, and the "traditions" to which the apostle refers may perfectly well be understood as comprising the main articles of faith which are committed to writing in other parts of the Scripture; while the two passages in the Epistles to Timothy evidently refer to some definite form of words or summary of the articles of faith, such as that found at a later date in the creed of the Church, but it does not in the very least follow that the doctrines contained in it are not also comprised in Holy Scripture.

There is, then, no valid argument to be drawn from Scripture itself against the position maintained in our article; nor have any other satisfactory arguments been put forward by Romanists on behalf of the view that tradition is, apart from Scripture, a source of necessary doctrine. The following weighty words from two of the ablest Anglican divines of the first half of the present century seem to put the whole matter on its right footing, and will form a suitable close to this discussion.

1. *On the sufficiency of Scripture.*—"While it is certainly true that it was not by Scripture that these Christian truths were delivered to the churches by the apostles, nor are they ordinarily thus learnt in the first instance by any; yet in that sole inspired record, of which the Church was the early recipient and constant guardian, it is her belief and affirmation that the whole body of life-giving doctrine is essentially contained; that the Spirit of God has provided that no saving truth should be there wanting. And however some important accessory facts may have been left to be proved altogether from minor ecclesiastical sources (such as the determination of the canon of Scripture itself, the apostolic observance of Sunday as the Lord's Day, that of the Christian Pascha and Pentecost, etc.), yet with matters of doctrine, properly so called, this has never been the case; whatever claiming to be such a integral part of the faith once delivered to the saints, cannot be proved by sure warranty of the Christian Scriptures is by that circumstance alone convicted of novelty and error."[1]

2. *On tradition.*—"If we mistake not the signs of the times, the period is not far distant when the whole controversy between the English and Romish Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute again brought under review. Of these points none is more important than the question respecting tradition; and it is, therefore, most essential that they who stand forth as the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject—the view, in short, which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition. They knew that in strictness of speech Scripture is tradition, written tradition. They knew that, as far as external evidence

[1] W. H. Mill, *Five Sermons on the Temptation*, Serm. i. p. 16.

is concerned, the tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the books of Scripture can be established. . . . What our reformers opposed was the notion that men must, upon the mere authority of tradition, receive as necessary to salvation doctrines not contained in Scripture. Against this notion in general, they urged the incredibility of the supposition that the apostles, when unfolding in their writings the principles of the gospel, should have entirely omitted any doctrines essential to man's salvation. The whole tenor, indeed, of those writings, as well as of our blessed Lord's discourses, runs counter to the supposition that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral tradition. With respect to the particular doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to tradition, our reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an unbroken chain of tradition from the apostolic age, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early Fathers. Such was the view of this important question taken by our reformers. In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course; they neither bowed submissively to the authority of tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We in the present day must tread in their footsteps, and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success. We must be careful that, in our anxiety to avoid one extreme, we run not into the other, by adopting the extravagant language of those who, not content with ascribing a paramount authority to the written word on all points pertaining to eternal salvation, talk as if the Bible—and that, too, the Bible in our English translation—were, independently of all external aids and evidence, sufficient to prove its

own genuineness and inspiration, and to be its own interpreter."[1]

II. *The Canon of Holy Scripture.*

There are so many different topics claiming attention under this head that it will be convenient to subdivide it and consider the following points separately:—

(*a*) The meaning of the terms canon and canonical.

(*b*) The method of determining what books are canonical.

(*c*) The question at issue between England and Rome concerning the canon of the Old Testament.

(*d*) The canon of the New Testament.

(*a*) *The meaning of the terms canon and canonical.*— The Greek word κάνων means primarily a straight rod, and so generally a carpenter's rule. Hence it is applied metaphorically, like the Latin *regula* and *norma* to anything which serves to regulate or determine other things, *i.e. a rule* or *standard.* In this sense it is used by S. Paul in 2 Cor. x. 13, 15, 16 and Gal. vi. 16,[2] as by other early Christian writers, such as S. Clement of Rome.[3] But it very soon came to have a definite meaning stamped upon it in the Church as the "rule of truth or faith" (ὁ κάνων τῆς ἀληθείας, τῆς πίστεως),[4] *i.e.* that by which the faith of Christians was regulated, the standard by which their orthodoxy was measured; and so it is applied especially to the creed as containing this rule or standard. From this the transition is natural to that use of the word which is very familiar to us in the expression

[1] Bishop Kaye, *Tertullian*, pp. 299–304.

[2] In Phil. iii. 16 it is an interpolation. In the Septuagint the word is only found three times, namely, in Micah vii. 4; Judith xiii. 6; 4 Maccabees, vii. 21; Aquila has it also in Job xxxviii. 5; Ps. xviii. (xix.) 5.

[3] Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* i. i. vii. xli.

[4] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. p. 676; Tertullian, *regula* (=κάνων); *De Monog.* ii.; *Apol.* xlvi. etc.

"Canons of Councils," namely, decisions on particular points which were thus ruled by the Church. The substantive *κάνων* being so used, the adjective *κανονικός* and the verb *κανονίζειν* also came into familiar use in connection with what was so ruled. And it is in these derivatives that we meet with the earliest application of the word to the Scriptures, the books of which are spoken of by so early a writer as Origen, if we may trust the Latin translation of his works, as *Scripturæ Canonicæ*, *Canonizatæ Scripturæ*, and *Libri Canonizati*,[1] *i.e.* the books *which have been admitted by rule.* Not till towards the close of the fourth century does the substantive "canon" occur of the Holy Scriptures, but from its appearance then, in a number of different writers, it must already have been a recognised term for some little time. The earliest instance of its occurrence that has been traced is in the catalogue of the Scriptures by Amphilochius (*circa* 380). After giving a list of the books this writer proceeds to say, "This would be the most unerring rule (*κάνων*) of the inspired Scriptures,"[1] *i.e.* the *standard or measure* by which all books claiming divine authority might be tested. Hence the word came to be used of the *whole collection of books thus admitted by rule*—the books accepted by the Church were said to be "in the canon." So the phrase is used by Rufinus[2] and other writers of the close of the fourth century. And, finally, the adjective "canonical" was used no longer in a passive sense, meaning that the books were *authorised*, or *ruled to be accepted* by the Church, but rather in an active sense, of the same books, regarded as *authoritative*, or *giving the rule of faith*, the sense in which the term is

[1] Origen, *De Principiis*, iv. 33; *Com. in Matt.* § 28 *cf.* § 117. The phrase *haberi in canone* also occurs in the Latin translation (*Prol. in Cant.*), but it is thought to be only the translator's version of *κανονίζεσθαι*.

[2] *Amphiloch.* vii. [3] Rufinus in *Symb. Apost.* § 37.

familiarly used by us when we speak of a book as "canonical"—the "canonical books" being those books to which the ultimate appeal lies in matters of necessary doctrine, and the "Canon of Scripture" representing the collection of such books, It is probably owing to their use in the writings of Jerome and Augustine[1] that both terms "canon" and "canonical" passed into the common language of Western Christendom.[2]

(*b*) *The method of determining what books are canonical.* —On this matter the language of the article is perfectly clear. **In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.** The Church of England appeals to the historical evidence of reception by the visible Church, which, as Article XX. states, is "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ." This method of determining the canonicity of the books is in complete accordance with the general appeal which the Church of England makes to antiquity. It stands in sharp contrast to the method adopted by most of the Protestant communities in the sixteenth century, who preferred to base their acceptance of the books of Scripture on the "inner witness of the Spirit,"[3] a witness which, however comforting and assuring to the believer who is conscious of

[1] Jerome, *Præf. in Libr. Salom. Prol. Galeatus*; cf. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei.* xvii. 24; xviii. 38.

[2] See on this subject Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 110, and Bishop Ellicott's *New Testament for English Readers*, vol. i. p. xii.

[3] See the *Gallic Confession*, Art. iv.: "Nous connoissons ces livres estre canoniques et reigle tres certaine de nostre Foy non tant par le commun accord et consentement de l'Eglise, que par le tesmoignage et intérieure persuasion du S. Espirit, qui les nous fait discerner d'avec les autres livres Ecclésiastiques, sur lesquels (encore qu'il soyent utiles) on ne peut fonder aucun Article de Foy." So the *Belgic Confession*, ch. v.: "Hos libros solos recipimus tanquam sacros et canonicos, quibus fides nostra inniti, confirmari et stabiliri possit. Itaque absque ulla dubitatione ea omnia

feeling it in himself, is yet scarcely likely to convince any who still need convincing, and which is practically useless as a test for deciding what books are to be accounted canonical. Indeed, as Alford points out, "any reasoning must be not only in itself insufficient, but logically unsound, which makes the authority of a book which is to set us our standard of doctrine, the result of a judgment of our own respecting the doctrine inculcated in it." [1]

But the question may be, and has been, raised, How does this appeal to the authority of the Church in settling what *is* Holy Scripture agree with the teaching of the article itself that Holy Scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation?" The question was one which was apparently often put to the Anglican apologists in the sixteenth century. Accordingly, it is touched upon by Hooker in the first book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. "It may be, and oftentimes hath been, demanded, how the books of Holy Scripture contain in them all necessary things, when, of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for Scripture to teach." The question thus fairly proposed by Hooker is by him as fairly answered. After pointing out that in every art or science *something* must be taken for granted to start with, he proceeds as follows: — "Albeit Scripture do profess to contain in it all things which are necessary to salvation; yet the meaning cannot be simply of all things which are necessary, but all things that are necessary in some certain kind or form; as all things which are neces-

credimus, quæ in illis continentur. Idque non tam quod ecclesia illos pro canonicis recipiat et comprobet; quam quod Spiritus Sanctus nostris conscientiis testetur illos a Deo emanasse; et eo maxime quod ipsi etiam per se sacram hanc suam authoritatem et sanctitatem testentur atque comprobent; quum et ipsi cæci rerum omnium, quæ in illis scriptis prædictæ fuerunt, implectionem et executionem clare conspicere et veluti sensibus percipere possint."

[1] *Greek Testament*, vol. iv. p. 85.

sary, and either could not at all or could not easily be known by the light of natural discourse; all things which are necessary to be known that we may be saved; but known with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain principles whereof it receiveth us already persuaded, and then instructeth us in all the residue that are necessary. In the number of these principles one is the sacred authority of Scripture. *Being therefore persuaded by other means that these Scriptures are the oracles of God, themselves do then teach us the rest, and lay before us all the duties which God requireth at our hands as necessary to salvation.*"[1] In other words, while Holy Scripture contains everything essential that is a matter of revelation, in order to discover in what books this revelation is contained we have recourse to ordinary historical evidence, and inquire what books have been accepted without doubt by the Church.

(*c*) *The question at issue between England and Rome concerning the canon of the Old Testament.*—Of the canonical books of the Old Testament, the article gives a complete list. There is, therefore, no room for doubt what is the mind of the Church of England on this point. For the view taken by the Roman Church, the decree of the Council of Trent is equally explicit. After the passage with regard to the authority of Scripture and tradition already cited, the decree proceeds to say that "it has been thought meet that a catalogue of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest doubt should arise in anyone's mind as to which are the books received by the Synod." [Then follows the list, including Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, First and Second Maccabees.] "But if anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, these same books *entire with all their parts*, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and *as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition*, and knowingly

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. i. ch. xiv. § 1.

and deliberately despise the traditions aforesaid, let him be anathema." The words placed in italics show us that we are intended to add to the books counted as canonical by the Church of Rome those additions to the books of Esther and Daniel which are found in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but which, as having no place in the Hebrew text, are relegated to a position in the Apocrypha by the Church of England, under the titles of The Rest of the Book of Esther, Bel and the Dragon, The Story of Susanna, and the Song of the Three Children.

Here, then, is a clear and decided difference between England and Rome, the latter counting as canonical almost all those books which the Church of England uses "for example of life and instruction of manners," but refuses to "apply them to establish any doctrine."

The origin of this difference lies far back, and must be sought in the Greek version of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, to which were appended various books (some translations from the Hebrew, others originally written in Greek), which were certainly not regarded as sacred by the Jews of Palestine, and probably not even by those of the dispersion. That the Jewish Church has never admitted into the canon those books to which we refuse a place in it, may be proved with abundant evidence. Josephus (A.D. 70), who is our earliest direct witness on the subject, reckons up the "two and twenty books which are justly believed to be divine; five books of Moses, thirteen of the prophets extending to the reign of Artaxerxes, and four which contain hymns and directions of life";[1] while of later books he says that they are not esteemed worthy of the same credit, "because the accurate succession of the prophets was not preserved." The witness of the Talmud (A D. 500) is to the same

[1] *Contra Apion.* 1, § 8. The thirteen prophets must be Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, *Chronicles, Ezra with Nehemiah, Esther, Job,*

effect,[1] while Philo supplies indirect evidence that the Jews of the dispersion agreed with their brethren in Palestine in this matter.[2] In the New Testament, though there are occasionally striking coincidences of language and thought with some of the books of the Apocrypha, yet there is not a single direct and acknowledged quotation from any one of them, while quotations from, and references to, almost all the books of the Hebrew canon abound.[3] Against this there is nothing to be set on the other side, and so we may conclude that there can be no reasonable doubt that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jewish canon contained the same books which it does at the present day, namely, those enumerated as canonical in our Articles, and none others.[4]

In the Christian Church our earliest witnesses all point to this list, and to this alone, as formally and distinctly recognised. But at the same time it needs very little

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, *Daniel*, and the minor prophets. The four others are Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. Other Jewish authorities generally reckon those in italics not among the prophets, but among the "Hagiographa," the third class of Josephus.

[1] *Baba Bathra*, fol. 14*b*.

[2] "His language shows that he was acquainted with the Apocryphal books, and yet he does not make a single quotation from them, though they offered much that was favourable to his views. On the other hand, in addition to the law, he quotes all the books of 'the prophets,' and the Psalms and Proverbs from the Hagiographa, and several of them with clear assertions of their 'prophetic' or inspired character. Of the remaining Hagiographa (Nehemiah, Ruth, Lamentations, First and Second Chronicles, Daniel, Ecclesiastes, Canticles) he makes no mention, but the first three may have been attached, as often in Hebrew usage, to other books (Ezra, Judges, Jeremiah), so that four writings alone are unattested by him."—Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 504 (Ed. 2).

[3] The only books of the Old Testament to which the New gives no direct attestation are Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

[4] For the history of the gradual growth of the Jewish canon, and of the doubts which existed in early days among Jewish doctors as to the canonicity of a few of the books, namely, Esther, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes, reference may be made to Professor Ryle's *History of the Canon of the Old Testament*. Cf. also the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 503.

research to discover that quotations from the Apocrypha are abundant in the writings of the Fathers, from the earliest days. This, however, is easily accounted for. The Fathers were, with scarcely an exception, ignorant of Hebrew, and dependent on the Septuagint Version for their knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. In this version, as we have seen, the books of the Apocrypha found a place. It was, therefore, only natural that the Fathers should fall into the habit of employing and quoting all the books in the collection with which they were familiar, and thus should gradually lose their sense of the distinction between the books of the Hebrew canon and the additions of the Septuagint. The "old Latin version" was made from the Septuagint, and consequently included the additional books. Hence the confusion passed over into the Western Church. But in spite of this growing recognition of the books of the Apocrypha, and the popular use of them, it remains that during the first four centuries every Father who gives a deliberate judgment on the subject, and has the slightest claim to occupy a representative position, accepts the Hebrew canon alone. In its behalf may be quoted the testimony of the Syriac (Peschito) version which is limited to the books of the Hebrew canon; the witness of Melito of Sardis (A.D. 180), who made the number of the books of the canon a subject of special inquiry;[1] Origen (220);[2] Cyril of Jerusalem (348);[3]

[1] See Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. xxvi. Melito does not mention *Esther* separately, but the suggestion has been made that it may have been reckoned with Ezra, as Nehemiah almost certainly was. See Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 136.

[2] See Eusebius, *H. E.* IV. xxv. Origen gives the Hebrew canon exactly as we have it.

[3] *Catech.* iv. § 35. Cyril includes Baruch in the canon, taking it as an appendix to Jeremiah; otherwise his list of the Old Testament coincides exactly with our own.

Athanasius (367);[1] Gregory Nazianzen (390)[2] in the East; and of Hilary of Poictiers (368);[3] Rufinus (390)[4] and Jerome (430)[5] in the West. Especially important is the testimony of the last-mentioned writer. He gives a complete and accurate list exactly coinciding with our own, and ends by saying, "Whatever is without the number of these must be placed among the Apocrypha."[6] Contemporary with Jerome was Augustine, and it is to his varying and uncertain language that the claim of the Apocrypha to be ranked as canonical must be traced. Not only does he freely quote (as others had done before him) books of the Apocrypha as Scripture, but (as others had *not* done before him) when formally enumerating the books contained in the canon of Scripture he includes these books among them without drawing any clear distinction between them,[7] although else-

[1] *Festal Epistles*, No. xxxix. Like Cyril, Athanasius includes Baruch, but he expressly excludes Esther from a place among the canonical books.

[2] *Carmina*, xii. 13. Esther is not mentioned in this list.

[3] *Prologus in Psalmos*, § 15. Hilary's list is identical with our own, though he mentions that some added to it the books of Tobit and Judith.

[4] In *Symbolum Apostolorum*, § 37. The list is exactly the same as ours, and expressly says that Tobit, Judith, etc., are "not canonical, but ecclesiastical."

[5] *Prologus Galeatus.*

[6] No reference is made in the text to the Fifty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodicæa (A.D. 363), which is often quoted as determining the canon of Scripture; because there appear to be very strong grounds for questioning the genuineness of that part of the decree which contains the list of the books. See Westcott *On the Canon*, p. 498. Hefele, however, accepts it as genuine (*History of the Councils*, vol. ii. p. 322 *seq.*, English translation). The list given in it is, however, exactly the same as our own. It ought to be added that many of the authorities quoted in the previous notes as accepting the Hebrew canon rather than the enlarged one of the Septuagint as authoritative, yet make use of the other books, and cite them from time to time as Scripture. This was under the circumstances only natural, and the same thing is equally true of our reformers. Habit and custom were often too strong for them. Hence the Apocrypha is freely quoted as "Scripture" and "the word of God" in the Homilies, and yet distinctly separated off from the canonical books of Scripture in the article.

[7] *De Doctrina Christiana* II. viii.: Totus autem Canon Scripturarum

where he seems occasionally to use language which implies that he recognised a distinction;[1] from which it has been inferred that possibly he really differed from Jerome only in language. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), at which Augustine himself is thought to have been present, recognised and adopted the enlarged canon of the Septuagint, including

. . . his libris continetur; quinque Moyseos, id est Genesi, Exodo, Levitico, Numeris, Deuteronomio ; et uno libro Jesu Nave, uno Judicum, uno libello qui adpellatur Ruth, qui magis ad Regnorum principium videtur pertinere ; deinde quatuor Regnorum, et duobus Paralipomenon, non consequentibus sed quasi a latere adjunctis, simulque pergentibus. Hæc est historia quæ sibimet adnexa tempora continet atque ordinem rerum. Sunt aliæ tanquam ex diverso ordine, quæ neque huic ordini neque inter se connectuntur, sicut est Job et *Tobias*, et Esther, et *Judith* et *Machabæorum libri duo*, et Esdræ duo, qui magis subsequi videntur ordinatam illam historiam usque ad Regnorum vel Paralipomenom terminatam. Deinde Prophetæ, in quibus David unus liber Psalmorum, et Salomonis tres : Proverbiorum, Cantica Canticorum, et Ecclesiastes. Nam illi duo libri, unus qui *Sapientia*, et alius qui *Ecclesiasticus* inscribitur, de quadam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur ; nam Jesus Sirach eos conscripsisse constantissime perhibetur ; qui tamen, quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt, inter propheticos numerandi sunt. Reliqui sunt eorum libri qui proprie prophetæ adpellantur duodecim prophetarum libri singuli, qui connexi sibimet, quoniam nunquam sejuncti sunt, pro uno habentur, quorum prophetarum nomina sunt hæc : Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachi; deinde quatuor prophetæ sunt majorum voluminum : Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Ezekiel. His quadraginta quatuor libris testamenti veteris terminatur auctoritas." The books of the Apocrypha are italicised in this list. It will be noticed that there is no mention of Baruch. This probably does not indicate rejection, but may be accounted for by supposing that it was reckoned along with Jeremiah. Cf. *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 33, *c. Faustum*, xii. 43.

[1] In *Contra Gaudentium*, i. 38, Augustine speaks of the books of the Maccabees "as received by the Church not without profit, if they be read with sobriety." In the *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 36, he says that a reckoning is found "not in the Holy Scriptures which are called canonical, but in others, among which are also the books of the Maccabees—which the Church and not the Jews account canonical, on account of the wonderful sufferings of the martyrs, etc." He thus draws a distinction between the books recognised by both the Jewish and the Christian Church, and those held in honour by the Christians only. Cf. *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 505.

the books of the Apocrypha.[1] The same is true of the decretals which bear the names of Innocent, Damasus, and Gelasius, and of many later writers, so that it may fairly be said that from the fifth century onwards, at least in the Western Church, the distinction between the two classes of books was generally obliterated. Nevertheless it has been pointed out with truth that in spite of this wide recognition of the Apocrypha as canonical "a continuous succession of the more learned fathers in the West maintained the distinctive authority of the Hebrew canon up to the period of the Reformation," and "repeat with approval the decision of Jerome, and draw a clear line between the canonical and apocryphal books."[2] It was thus reserved for the Council of Trent in 1546 to decide finally against this continuous stream of testimony, and, in giving its verdict against all the more critical of the Fathers, to stereotype the confusion which could never have arisen except in an age devoid of the first principles of criticism.[3]

It is remarkable that notwithstanding the decision of the Council of Trent taken so early to include the Apocrypha among the canonical books, Cranmer was content

[1] *Conc. Carth.* iii. Canon xxxix., repeating the decree of the Council of Hippo, A.D. 393. See Hefele, *History of Councils*, vol. ii. p. 400, English Translation.

[2] Bp. Westcott in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 507 (Ed. 2). The whole article should be consulted. Among the later writers who are there noted as drawing a distinction between the canonical books and the Apocrypha are S. Gregory the Great, Bede, Nicholaus de Lyra, Cajetan, and Ximenes. The last mentioned in the preface to the great *Complutensian Polyglot*, published in 1517, describes the books of which he can only print a Greek and not a Hebrew text, as "the books outside the canon, which the Church receives rather for the edification of the people than to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas."

[3] Of the distinction which is drawn by some Roman divines between Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical books, the latter having only an ethical authority, there is not the shadow of a trace in the Tridentine decree.

to issue the Anglican Articles in 1553 without any reference whatever to the question, for the list of books was, as has been already mentioned, not inserted until the revision by Parker in Elizabeth's reign. The omission in the earlier series is not easy to account for. That it cannot have been due to any hesitation felt by the Reformers is shown by the separation of the Apocrypha from the other books in the English Bibles published in the reign of Henry VIII. They are so separated in the edition of Coverdale (1535), and in the "Great Bible" of Cranmer (1539, 1540), and in both are described as "Apocrypha," for though the latter, by a curious blunder, has "Hagiographa" on the title-page of the section containing them, yet the running heading at the top of each page is "Apocrypha." Moreover, the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* devotes a section to the subject, and carefully distinguishes them from the books of the Hebrew canon, styling them "sacred but not canonical," assigning to them the very same position which was subsequently given to them in the Articles.[1]

It may be well to add a few words on the view taken by the Eastern Church on the canon of the Old Testament, although it is by no means clear what is binding on members of that communion, owing partly to the absence of authoritative symbolical books, and partly to the fact that conflicting judgments on this subject may be quoted. The Confession of Cyril Lucar in the seven-

[1] *Ref. Legum Eccl.* "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," ch. 7. *Libri sacri non tamen Canonici.* Liber vero qui Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur, Ecclesiasticus, item Judith, Tobias, Baruch, tertius et quartus Esdræ, libri Machabæorum, cum Apocryphis Hester et Danielis, leguntur quidem a fidelibus et in ecclesia recitantur, quod ad ædificationem plebis plurima in illis valeant, quibus tamen non tantum authoritatis tribuitur, ut fidei nostræ dogmata ex ipsis solis et separatim citra alios indubitatæ Scripturæ locos constitui, constabilirique, vel possint, vel debeant. Sunt ergo et cum judicio et sobrie isti tum audiendi tum legendi.

teenth century assigns an inferior rank to the additions of the Septuagint, and the same view is taken in the Confession of Metrophanes Critopulus put forth in 1625, especially for the information of the reformed bodies. "As to the other books which some would combine together with Holy Scripture, such as Tobit and the like, we do not hold that they are to be rejected, for they contain much that is moral and worthy of all praise. But as canonical and authentic they were not formerly received by the Church of Christ . . . wherefore we do not seek to establish our dogmas by them, but from the three and thirty canonical and authentic books which we call the inspired and Holy Scripture."[1] This judgment is repeated with approval by later writers, and probably represents the general opinion in the Greek Church; but on the other hand the Synod of Jerusalem (A.D. 1672), held "against the Calvinists," and violently hostile to Cyril Lucar, pronounced that the books which he had foolishly, ignorantly, or maliciously called Apocrypha, were to be received with the other genuine books of Holy Scripture, and to be acknowledged as "Canonical and Holy Scripture."[2]

The "Longer Catechism of the Russian Church" follows S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Athanasius, and S. John Damascene, in adopting the Hebrew canon, quoting S. Athanasius expressly as saying that the books which "do not exist in the Hebrew" are "appointed by the Fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the Church";[3] and we are told that "the officially-printed Russian Bibles contain the apocryphal

[1] Metrophanes Critopulus, *Confessio.* ch. vii., quoted in Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 61.

[2] *Synodus Hierosolymitanus, Dosithei Confessio*, Q. 3. Kimmel, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 467.

[3] *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, p. 38.

books, with a note to the effect that they are taken from the Greek version or are not found in the Hebrew text." [1]

(*d.*) *The canon of the New Testament.*—It is obvious that in the very limited space which alone can be devoted to the subject in a work of this character, it is impossible to do more than give the briefest summary of the evidence which has led the Church to accept the canon of the New Testament as it has come down to us. Fuller details must be sought in such works as Bishop Westcott's *History of the Canon of the New Testament*, or Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*. All that can be attempted here is to indicate the main outlines of the evidence, which may be summed up under four different heads, namely, the witness of (1) MSS., (2) Versions, (3) formal catalogues of the books, and (4) citations in early ecclesiastical writers. These four distinct branches of evidence all combine to establish the fact that the books of the New Testament, which we receive to-day, have come down to us from the days of the apostles; that, with the partial exceptions noted below, they have been recognised as sacred by the Church from the beginning; and that in very early days they were formed into a definite collection, so as to constitute a "New Testament" corresponding to the "Old."

1. **Manuscripts.** — The total number of manuscripts of the Greek Testament that are known to exist and have been examined with more or less care, amounts to something like twelve hundred. They are divided into two classes, known respectively as "uncial" and "cursives." The former class, written in capital letters, comprises all the more ancient among them, ranging from the fourth to the tenth century. The "cursives" are written in a small running hand, which began to come into use about the ninth century, and include the great

[1] *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 510.

bulk of the existing MSS. from that date to the sixteenth.

The oldest MSS. are the four great Bibles of the fourth and fifth centuries, containing the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, as well as the original Greek of the New. These are known to scholars under the following titles:—

i. *Codex Vaticanus* (B), in the Vatican Library at Rome, containing all the books of the New Testament except the later chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, and the Revelation of S. John.

ii. *Codex Sinaiticus* (א), discovered by Tischendorf in the convent of S. Catherine at Mount Sinai in 1859, now at St. Petersburg. This contains all the books of the New Testament without exception.

Both of these MSS. are unhesitatingly assigned to the middle of the fourth century.

iii. *Codex Alexandrinus* (A), in the British Museum. This, like the Sinaitic MS., contains every book of the New Testament, though several leaves are wanting at the beginning of S. Matthew's Gospel, as well as two or three in other parts of the volume.

iv. *Codex Ephraemi* (C), at Paris. This MS., in which the works of an eastern Father, Ephraem the Syrian, have been written over the Greek text of the Scriptures, is in a very fragmentary condition; but sufficient remains to show us that it also originally contained the whole New Testament. Together with Codex Alexandrinus it is set down as belonging to the fifth century.

Of later MSS. there is no need to give any account here. While to the textual critic many of them are of the highest value, they can scarcely be said to add materially to the evidence for the point that is here under consideration. But the existence of these four MSS. just enumerated is of itself sufficient to establish the existence

of the New Testament as a collected whole—a definite Canon — placed on a footing of equal authority with the Old Testament, some time before the date to which the earliest of them is assigned. And it may be added that the fact that there are such a number of MSS. remaining, many of them belonging to an early date, enables us to place far greater reliance on the correctness of the text of the New Testament than we can do on the text of any of the great classical writers of antiquity, whose works often rest on the evidence of one or two MSS., and those of a comparatively recent date.

2. **Versions.**—While the MSS. of the Greek Testament thus testify to the existence of the collection before the middle of the fourth century, we are enabled, by the aid of the versions, to prove its acceptance by the Church some two centuries earlier still. For we find that before the second century had come to a close the books of the New Testament had been already translated into the vernacular in more than one country. The two oldest and most important versions or translations known to us are the Old Latin and the Syriac. Of these the former was in use in North Africa, probably in the days of Tertullian (A.D. 200), and certainly a considerable time before the days of S. Cyprian, by whom it is frequently quoted some fifty years later. It is, perhaps, scarcely correct to speak of the Old Latin as a single version. The MSS. of it which remain fall into distinct groups, from which scholars have concluded that besides the African text, used by Cyprian and others, there was another current, generally known as the European, which may have been originally an *independent* version.[1] Should

[1] From the European was probably formed the Italic, the third form in which the Old Latin is known to us. On these versions and their relation to each other see Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, vol. ii. ch. iii. (Ed. 4).

this prove to be correct it will supply us with a fresh evidence to the existence and widespread use of the books of the New Testament in early days.

No *complete* Old Latin version remains to us. It has come down in a partial and fragmentary form in the existing MSS.; but enough remains to enable us to state with certainty that the version contained all the books of our present canon, except the Epistle of S. James, the Second Epistle of S. Peter, and (at least in the first instance) the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Still older, perhaps, than the Old Latin is the original Syriac translation. The Peshito or Simple version is the Vulgate of the Syriac Church, and of itself can claim a high antiquity, although its actual date in the revised form in which it has come down to us is hard to determine. It has been placed by some scholars as early as the end of the second century; by others some time later. But portions of a still more ancient Syriac version have lately come to light. In 1842 a few fragments of a MS. of the fifth century were brought to England, and found to contain a limited number of passages from each of the four Gospels in a Syriac translation, different from that previously known. These were edited by Dr. Cureton, from whom the version is known as the Curetonian Syriac. It is thought to contain an older unrevised text, and to be *not later than the middle of the second century.* Since Cureton's day a second MS. of a recension of the same version has been discovered at Mount Sinai.[1] which, happily, contains the whole of the Gospels. Whether this oldest Syriac version ever contained more than this it is impossible at present to determine. But in its revised form in the Peshito the canon of the Syriac Church comprises the

[1] In 1892 by Mrs. Lewis, by whom an English translation of the Gospels has been published (1894).

whole of the New Testament except 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse.

A third group of versions must also be mentioned, namely, the Egyptian. Of these there are various forms known to us, now generally termed "Boharic," "Sahidic" (or "Thebaic"), and "Bashmuric," as well as fragments in other dialects. The early history of these is very obscure, but it has been said by a competent authority that we "should probably not be exaggerating if we placed one or both the Egyptian versions, the Boharic and Sahidic, or at least parts of them before the close of the second century."[1] Nor is there room for doubt that these versions contained the whole of the books of our present canon with the exception of the Apocalypse.

3. **Catalogues.**—Besides MSS. and versions, a third important branch of evidence is furnished by the formal lists of the books of Scripture drawn up in the early centuries. Of these several have come down to us from the fourth century, when the canon of Scripture was made a special subject of inquiry and was finally settled in the Church. The list of the books of the New Testament, exactly as we have them at present, was definitely ratified at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397).[2] The catalogues given by Rufinus[3] (390) in Italy, by Gregory Nazianzen[4] (389) and Amphilochius[5] (*circa* 380) in Asia Minor, by Athanasius[6] (367) in Alexandria, and Cyril of Jerusalem[7] (348) in Palestine supply further evidence reaching back to the first half of the same century. In these the only book concerning the acceptance of which there is any hesitation expressed is the Apocalypse. While it is definitely recognised as canon-

[1] Scrivener, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 98.
[2] *Conc. Carth.* Canon xxxix.
[3] *In Symb.* § 37.
[4] *Carmina*, § 1, xii. 5.
[5] *Ad Seleuch.*
[6] *Ep. Fest.* xxxix.
[7] *Catech.* iv. 36.

ical by Rufinus and Athanasius, it is passed over in silence by Cyril,[1] and expressly rejected by Gregory Nazianzen and Amphilochius.

For the earlier part of the fourth century we have a still more important witness in the list of the books given by Eusebius in the third book of his *Ecclesiastical History*,[2] in which he sums up the results of his investigation on the subject of the canon. In this he tells us that all the books for which any claim to divine authority has been made may broadly be divided into two classes—(1) the acknowledged books (*ὁμολογούμενα*), and (2) those which were disputed (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*). In the first class (which he elsewhere describes as "canonical and acknowledged")[3] he places the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of S. Paul, the First Epistle of S. Peter, and the First of S. John, and (with some hesitation) the Apocalypse. In the second class he finds it necessary to make a subdivision. (*a*) Some of the disputed books, or Antilegomena, were nevertheless "recognised by most," and these form a separate class, including the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter. (*b*) The remaining Antilegomena are set aside as spurious (*νόθα*), *e.g.* the Acts of Paul, the Pastor of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles," and the Revelation of S. John, "which some reject, but others class with the acknowledged books." Nothing is said expressly in this passage concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews. But as there is no mention of it among the disputed books it may be supposed to be included among the Epistles of S. Paul,

[1] As it is also in the list appended to the fifty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodicea.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxv.

[3] III. iii. *περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων.*

as it apparently is in an earlier chapter of the same book,[1] although elsewhere it is spoken of as one of the Antilegomena.[2]

The importance of this passage of Eusebius can hardly be exaggerated. Eusebius had made the reception of the various books of the New Testament a subject of special inquiry; and the outcome of his researches was that he was aware of no doubts whatever as to the genuineness and authenticity of the great bulk of the books which have come down to us. Concerning *seven* books only, were doubts expressed by some of the authors whom he consulted. But for all these he was able to quote testimonies from earlier writers, and his deliberate judgment concerning them was that they were generally known and recognised.

There appear to be no formal catalogues of the Scriptures belonging to the third century. But of a second century list one precious fragment remains. It is commonly known as the "Muratorian Fragment on the Canon," from its discoverer and first editor, Muratori.[3] Its date, which is fixed by internal evidence, must be placed in the latter part of the *second* century.[4] The beginning of the document is unfortunately lost, and in other parts it appears to be mutilated. But that if we possessed it entire we should find that the Gospels according to S. Matthew and S. Mark were recognised,

[1] III. iii. "Paul's fourteen epistles are well-known and undisputed (*πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς*). It is not, indeed, right to ignore the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it was disputed (*ἀντιλέγεσθαι*) by the Church of Rome, on the ground that it was not written by Paul."

[2] *H. E.* VI. xiii.

[3] The fragment is printed in Westcott's *History of the Canon*, Appendix C, and in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 393.

[4] Dr. Salmon seems to stand alone in assigning it to the *third* century, see the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 1002.

there can be no reasonable doubt—for the opening sentences of what remains assign the *third* place to the Gospel of S. Luke, and the *fourth* to that of S. John. Besides these the fragment mentions the Acts of the Apostles; thirteen Epistles of S. Paul; the Epistle of S. Jude; two (or three)[1] Epistles of S. John; the Apocalypses of John and Peter, "which last some will not have read in the Church." There is no mention in the fragment of the Epistles of S. Peter, the Epistle of S. James, or (apparently) of that to the Hebrews.[2] But as the MS is only a fragment, no great stress can be laid on these omissions, and we may feel sure that in its original form it must at least have included the *first* Epistle of S. Peter, as we never hear of doubts expressed elsewhere concerning the reception of this.

This is the earliest catalogue of the Scriptures that has come down to us. It proves conclusively two things—*first*, that before the close of the second century a definite canon of the New Testament had been formed; and, *secondly*, that this was substantially the same as our own, although, as we have seen, so late as the fourth century, some hesitation was felt in various quarters concerning the canonicity of a limited number of the books.

4. **Citations in early writers.**—In order (1) to bridge over the interval between the latter part of the

[1] "Though only two Epistles of John are here mentioned, the opening sentence of the First Epistle has been quoted in the paragraph treating the Gospel; and it is possible that our writer may have read that epistle as a kind of appendix to the Gospel, and is here speaking of the other two."—*Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 1001. It is certainly hard to think that anyone could have accepted either the Second or Third Epistle without the other.

[2] It has been suggested that the Epistle to the Hebrews may be referred to as the Epistle to the Alexandrians, which the writer speaks of as "forged under the name of Paul, bearing on" (or "in the interest of") "the heresy of Marcion."

second century and the apostolic age, and also (2) to establish the genuineness of the "Antilegomena" recourse must be had to the fourth branch of evidence.

To the same age as the writer of the Muratorian fragment belong Tertullian and Irenæus; both of whom bear witness to the acceptance by the Church of a definite "canon" of Scripture.[1] But earlier than about the year A.D. 170, although there is ample evidence of the existence of all or almost all the books, the indications of a definite *collection* of them are but slight. In this period the canon of the New Testament was only being gradually formed by the separation of the genuine and authentic writings of apostles and apostolic men from all others.

That a "fourfold gospel" was acknowledged at a comparatively early date is shown by the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (A.D. 150–160), the recent discovery of which has placed beyond dispute the fact that it was a harmony of our four canonical Gospels.[2] Nor can there now be reasonable grounds for doubt that these four were known and used by Tatian's master, *Justin Martyr* (140), by whom they are spoken of as the "Memoirs of the Apostles," and said to have been written by "apostles and apostolic men."[3] To a still earlier date (*circa* 130) we are taken by the fragments which remain of the work of *Papias of Hierapolis*, one of which, preserved by Eusebius, describes the origin of Gospels attributed to Matthew and Mark, which it is only natural to identify with those which

[1] On the evidence of Tertullian and Irenæus see Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. xiii.

[2] See *The Earliest Life of our Lord*, by H. Hill; and Hemphill's Tatian's *Diatessaron*.

[3] *Apol.* I. lxvi. lxvii.; cf. ch. xxxiii.; *Dial.* lxxxviii. c. etc. See on the evidence of Justin Martyr Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, p. 86, and for proof that Justin was acquainted with the Gospel of S. John, reference may be made especially to Ezra Abbot's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*.

certainly passed under these names a few years later.[1]

This brings us very near to the date at which the Gospels were written, and when it is added that in the writings of the apostolic Fathers and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,[2] there are many striking coincidences of language with passages found in all the four Gospels, we need not hesitate to set these down as proofs of their existence and acceptance by the Church, from the days of those who were themselves the pupils and companions of the apostles.

Equally clear is the witness of citations from early writers for the remainder of the books which Eusebius ranked as "acknowledged," [3] and although it is clear that

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxxix.; cf. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 142 *seq.*

[2] S. Matt. xx. 6 is actually quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. iv., as Scripture, being quoted with the formula ὡς γέγραπται. There is a possible allusion to the Four Gospels in the *Pastor of Hermas*, vis. iii. 13. With S. Matt. vii. 1, 2, and S. Luke, vi. 36–38, cf. Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* I. xiii., *Ep. Polyc.* ch. ii.; with S. Matt. xxvi. 24, and S. Mark xiv. 21, cf. Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* ch. xlvi.; with S. Matt. xxvi. 44, and S. Mark xiv. 38, cf. Polycarp, ch. vii.; with S. John vi. 32, 51, 53, vii. 38, cf. Ignatius, *Ad Rom.* vii.; with S. John x. 7, *Ad Philad.* ix. The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* appears to borrow freely from S. Matthew's Gospel. It also has coincidences with S. Luke (see ch. i., ix.), and S. John.

[3] From the *Acts of the Apostles* we have a clear quotation in Polycarp i., cf. Acts ii. 24; and coincidences with Clement of Rome, ch. ii. (cf. Acts xx. 35), and Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* iii.; cf. Acts x. 41.

The *First Epistle to the Corinthians* is expressly quoted as St. Paul's by Clement of Rome (ch. xlvii.), that to the *Philippians* by Polycarp, ch. iii. In Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* ch. xii., there is a reference to "every epistle" of S. Paul's, which seems to imply a collection of them. Besides these there are numerous verbal coincidences so close as to be marked by Bishop Lightfoot as quotations. Thus for *Romans* see Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xix.; Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* vi. x.

1 *Corinthians*, Clement of Rome, xxxiv. Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xvi. xviii.; *Ad Rom.* v.; *Ad Philad.* iii.; Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* iv. v. x. xi.

2 *Corinthians*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* ii. vi.

Galatians, Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xvi. Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* iii. v.

the "disputed" books only gradually won their way to universal recognition, yet it is believed that the final judgment of the Church in each case was correct, and that their genuineness can be satisfactorily established both from external and from internal evidence.[1]

The brief sketch which has here been given, slight as it is, will be sufficient to show the nature of the grounds on which the Church has accepted the Canon of the New Testament. It will have made it clear that the great majority of the books must have been received from the days of the apostles without question, but that *seven* were not universally received until the latter part of the fourth century. Turning now to the text of the article to see what is said on the canon of the New Testament, we are met by a difficulty. No list of the books is given, as in the case of the Old Testament. But two distinct statements are made which it is not

Ephesians, Ignatius, *Ad Polyc.* v. Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* i. xii.
Philippians, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* ix. xii.
Colossians, Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* x.
2 *Thessalonians*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* xi.
1 *Timothy*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* iv. xii.
2 *Timothy*, *ibid.* v. ix.
Titus, Clement of Rome, ii.
1 *Peter*, Clement of Rome, xxx. (?) Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* v. (?) Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* i. ii. v. vii. viii. x.
1 *John*, Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* vii.

[1] Of the disputed books there is strong attestation to both the *Epistle to the Hebrews* and the *Epistle of S. James* in Clement of Rome. See ch. xxx. xxxvi. xliii. xlix. There are *doubtful* allusions to 2 Peter in the same epistle. For 2 and 3 John and S. Jude nothing earlier than the Muratorian Fragment can be quoted. But for the Apocalypse there is ample evidence in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* lxxxi.; cf. *Apol.* xxviii.), Hermas (Vis. ii. 4; iv. 2), and Papias (see Lightfoot, *Supernatural Religion*, p. 214). For 2 Peter the external evidence is weaker than for any other book of the New Testament. The "clear evidence begins with Origen, who, however, mentions that the epistle was doubted." See Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 382, and on the whole subject of the Genesis of the New Testament, see *ibid.* Lectures, vi. vii.

altogether easy to reconcile with each other. It is first stated that **in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;** and finally, at the close of the article, there is another statement on the subject, saying that **all the books of the New Testament as they are commonly received we do receive and account canonical.** Now there is no question that at the date at which the article was drawn up all the Antilegomena were "commonly received," and therefore to judge by the last paragraph of the article they ought to be received now, whereas if the terms of the earlier statement be interpreted strictly they should be excluded, for most certainly doubts have been expressed concerning their authority in the Church.

It is hard to find a satisfactory explanation of this ambiguity. A suggestion has been made that it was of set purpose that the terms of the article were not made more precise. There certainly was at that time an inclination in some quarters to form a "canon within a canon," or even to reject one or two of the books of the New Testament altogether. Luther, for instance, finding that S. James' language on justification by works was scarcely in harmony with his own theory on the subject was at one time disposed to reject this epistle,[1] while

[1] "With bold self-reliance he created a purely subjective standard for the canonicity of the Scriptures, in the character of their "teaching of Christ," and while he placed the Gospel and First Epistle of S. John, the Epistles of S. Paul to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the First Epistle of S. Peter, in the first rank, as containing the "kernel of Christianity," he set aside the Epistles to the Hebrews, S. Jude, S. James, and the Apocalypse at the end of his version, and spoke of them, and of the remaining Antilegomena with varying degrees of disrespect, though he did not separate 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John from the other Epistles."—*Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 518. For Luther's

others among the foreign reformers were anxious to place the Antilegomena on a lower level than the rest of the books. It is possible, therefore, that the article was left as it now stands, in order to give some latitude for subscription, so that those scholars who were led to place any of the Antilegomena on a lower level of authority might be able to shelter themselves behind the conflicting terms of the article. "A distinction," says Bishop Westcott, "remains between the 'canonical' books, and such 'canonical books as have never been doubted in the Church,' and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the framers of the Articles intended to leave a freedom of judgment on a point on which the greatest of the continental reformers, and even of Romish scholars (Sixtus Sen. *Biblioth.* s. ii. 1; Cajetan, *Præf. ad Epp., ad Hebr., Jac.*, 2, 3 *John, Jude*) were divided."[1] This view is possible, but it is perhaps over-subtle, and moreover it would involve the admission that the Antilegomena, though "canonical," are not included in what the article calls "Holy Scripture," for in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church; and it has been proposed to understand "the Church" in the clause just quoted as referring to the *Church universal.* It is on the whole true, even of the Antilegomena, that though their authority has been questioned in particular parts of the Church, yet, so far as we know, there has never been any doubt about their authority in the *Church as a whole.*[2]

language on the Epistle of S. James, which he actually described as a "right strawy epistle," see Huther's *Commentary on St. James* (E. T.), p. 25.

[1] *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 518.

[2] "Some of them, as, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse—have been the subject of much doubt in the East and West, as the case may be. But the article asserts that there has been no doubt

According to Eusebius they were "recognised by most" of the writers whom he consulted, and so the words of the article might fairly be taken to cover them all.

III. *The Position of "the other Books."*

Under this head it will be well to consider separately—

(*a*) The meaning of the term "Apocrypha."

(*b*) The position assigned to the Apocrypha by the Church of England, and the arguments by which it may be supported.

(*a*) *The meaning of the term Apocrypha.*—The adjective ἀπόκρυφος is used in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and in the New Testament in its ordinary classical sense of "hidden" or "secret" (see S. Luke viii. 17, Col. ii. 3, and cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 19). From this meaning it was employed even in pre-Christian times by teachers who claimed a higher "esoteric" wisdom, which they embodied in secret, *i.e.* apocryphal writings.[1] The plan of embodying teaching in such "secret" books which might not be openly read and used was one against which the Church set her face from the beginning. But it was the plan adopted by many of the heretical sects, and hence the word "apocryphal" as applied to their writings rapidly came to be a word of reproach, and to denote the ideas of *spurious* and *heretical*. It has been thought that this reference of the word was facilitated by an analogous use of a Hebrew word with

about them in the Church Catholic; that is, at the very first time that the Catholic or whole Church had the opportunity of forming a judgment on the subject, it pronounced in favour of the canonical books. The Epistle to the Hebrews was doubted by the West, and the Apocalypse by the East, only while those portions of the Church investigated separately from each other, only till they compared notes, interchanged sentiments, and formed a united judgment."—J. H. Newman, in *Tract XC.* p. 6, Reprint of 1865.

[1] Cf. 2 Esdras xii. 37, 38, xiv. 44.

much the same meaning. The late Hebrew or Aramaic term *Genuzim* (= hidden) was applied by the Jews originally to the worn-out copies of the Scripture rolls, which were no longer suitable for use in the synagogue, and were therefore withdrawn and consigned to a special chamber, known as the Genizah. It thus came to denote that a book was for some cause or other unfit for public reading.[1] How far it was as a translation of *Genuzim* that Apocryphal came into familiar use in the Christian Church it is hard to say, but it is certain that during the second century it was employed as a term of reproach, as described above. In this way it is used by such early writers as Irenæus,[2] Tertullian,[3] and Clement of Alexandria;[4] and this sense has attached to the adjective "apocryphal" ever since, so that by the term Apocryphal Gospels are denoted the spurious Gospels forged by heretics, and rejected by the Church. This appears to be the invariable use of the word till well on in the fourth century. Before this time it was never applied to those books which were "read in the Church for example of life and instruction of manners." These were ordinarily termed Ecclesiastical, and were carefully distinguished from the discredited Apocryphal works. Rufinus writing towards the close of the fourth century describes very clearly the practice of an earlier age. After enumerating the books of the Hebrew Bible and of the New Testament, he says: "These are the books which the Fathers included in the canon, and from which they wished the assertions of our faith to be established." He then adds the following: "But you must know that

[1] See Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 105, and cf. Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, p. 91. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, p. 56.

[2] *Adv. Hær.* bk. I. ch. xiii.

[3] *De Pudic*, ch. x. xx; *De Anima*, ch. ii.

[4] *Strom.* I. xix. 69.

there are other books which were called by our ancestors not Canonical but Ecclesiastical; that is, that which is called the Wisdom of Solomon, and another which is called the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, which book is called among the Latins by the descriptive name Ecclesiasticus, by which term not the author of the book but the kind of the writing is designated. And of the same order is the Book of Tobit, and Judith, and the Books of the Maccabees. And in the New Testament, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Two Ways, and the Judgment of Peter, all of which they wished to be read indeed in Church, but not to be brought forward for confirming the authority of the faith from them. But the rest of the writings they termed Apocryphal, which they would not have read in Church."[1] In the fourth century, however, a wider meaning was given to the word "apocryphal." S. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* contents himself with a twofold division of the books—(1) the canonical ones, which alone he would have read in Church, and (2) the apocryphal ones, against which he urgently warns his hearers.[2] Since the canonical books, of which he gives a list, embrace only those of the Hebrew canon, it is manifest that "apocryphal" is used by him in the sense of "withdrawn from public reading," and indicates nothing as to the character of the books to which it was applied. Practically it becomes the equivalent of "non-canonical." In this use of the word Cyril is followed by S. Jerome at the end of the century. In his famous "Prologus Galeatus," the preface to his new translation of the Scriptures, he gives a list of the books of the Hebrew Canon, after which he says: "Quicquid extra hos est, *inter Apocrypha* esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Syrach liber, et Judith, et Tobias,

[1] *In Symb.* § 38.

[2] St. Cyril, *Catech.* iv. 35.

et Pastor *non sunt in Canone.*"[1] Here, exactly as in S. Cyril, the word means nothing more than non-canonical, and includes the books which had been usually termed Ecclesiastical, as well as those spurious and rejected ones to which the term had commonly been applied. It is probably from this passage of S. Jerome that the *substantive* Apocrypha has been formed, as the title of that collection of books which the Church of England declines to regard as canonical, but reads in the Church for example of life and instruction of manners.

The following table will serve to illustrate what has been said, and will help to make clear the varying sense of the word:—

	Hebrew Books regarded by the Jews as Authoritative.	Greek Books, not regarded by the Jews as Sacred, but read publicly by the Church.	Spurious and Rejected Books.
The Early Church	Canonical	Ecclesiastical	Apocryphal
S. Jerome (after S. Cyril)	Canonical	Apocryphal	
The Church of England	Canonical	The Apocrypha	Apocryphal
The Church of Rome	Canonical		Apocryphal

(*b*) *The position assigned by the Church of England to the Apocrypha, and the arguments by which it may be supported.* — It will be evident from what has been

[1] There is this difference between the use of the word in Jerome and Cyril. Jerome distinctly applies it to books which *were publicly read in church*, while Cyril would apparently have none but the canonical books read, and therefore with him the term "apocryphal" very fairly corresponds to the Hebrew *Genuzim*. Cf. also the use of the word in Origen's "Letter to Africanus," *Opera*, vol. i. p. 12 *seq.*

already said that the position assigned to these books by the Church of England is precisely that given to them by the early Church. "**The other books (as Hierome saith), the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.** The statement of Jerome upon which this is based has been already quoted, as also the very similar language of Rufinus. The practice of the Church of England has been objected to on two opposite grounds. Romanists, who have obliterated the distinction between these books and those of the Hebrew canon, maintain that we do not assign proper honour to them. Protestants have complained that we show them too much respect. The sketch of the history of the canon of the Old Testament given in an earlier section will show the grounds upon which the practice of the Church of England may be justified as against Roman objections. Our contention is that the position which we assign to these books is identical with that given to them in the primitive Church. In reply to the objection brought from the opposite quarter we cannot do better than follow the guidance of Richard Hooker, who was called on to defend the practice of the Church against the Puritans, who wished to do away with the use of these books altogether. He meets the objection—(1) by the appeal to the practice of antiquity; (2) by showing that since we make clear that there is a real distinction between these books and the canonical ones, no confusion between the two can arise; (3) by pointing out "the divine excellency of some things in all, and of all things in certain of those Apocrypha"; and (4) by the pertinent question: "If in that which we are to read there happen by the way any clause, sentence, or speech that soundeth towards error, should the mixture of a little dross constrain the Church to deprive

herself of so much gold, rather than learn how by art and judgment to make separation of the one from the other?"[1]

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, bk. v. ch. xx. It may be added that in Hooker's day the defence of the practice of the Church was harder than it is in our own. Bel and the Dragon, and Susanna and the Elders, were scarcely edifying, nor was all of Tobit suitable for public reading in Church. That there was some ground for the Puritan objections was admitted shortly after Hooker wrote, for in the revision of the Prayer Book made after the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, Bel and the Dragon and Tobit v. vi. and viii. were omitted from the daily lessons. Most unwisely, as it seems, they were restored after the Savoy Conference in 1662, and remained in use among the daily lessons until the revision of the Lectionary in 1871. This revision materially reduced the number of lessons from the Apocrypha, and at the present day nothing is read except from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch.

ARTICLE VII

De Veteri Testamento.

Testamentum vetus Novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quam novo, per Christum, qui unicus est mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et Homo, æterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam lex a Deo data per Mosen, quoad Cæremonias et ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus præcepta in aliqua Republica necessario recipi debeant; nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum quæ Moralia vocantur, nullus quantumvis Christianus est solutus.

Of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

This article was brought into its present form by Archbishop Parker in 1563, being formed out of two separate articles of the Edwardian series.

Article VI. of that set was entitled, "The Old Testament is not to be refused." It ran as follows:—

"The Old Testament is not to be put away as though it were contrary to the New, but to be kept still, for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises."

Article XIX. of the same series was this: "All men are bound to keep the moral law."

"The law which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the ceremonies and rites of the same; neither is it required that the civil precepts and orders of it should of necessity be received in any commonwealth: yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and lose from the obedience of those commandments which are called moral. Wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learnt such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."

The object of the article is evidently to condemn two opposite errors, which were current in the sixteenth century among some of the Anabaptist sects.

1. The opinions of those who rejected the Old Testament entirely, and claimed to be themselves superior to the demands of the moral law, as laid down in it. Of these Anabaptists there is a notice in a work of Alley, Bishop of Exeter, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, which aptly illustrates the language of the article.

"Here I note only one thing, which is the temerity, ignorance, and blasphemy of certain phantastical heads, which hold that the prophets do write only to the people of the Old Testament, and that their doctrine did pertain only to their time; and would seclude all the Fathers that lived under the law from the hope of eternal salvation. And here is also a note to be gathered against them which utterly reject the Old Testament, as a book nothing necessary to the Christians which live under the gospel."[1]

[1] Alley's *Poore Man's Librarie*, ii. 97, quoted in Hardwick *On the Articles*, p. 395.

2. While some of the Anabaptists thus set aside the Old Testament as unnecessary, others adopted an error of a different character, and insisted that the whole civil and ceremonial law was still a matter of divine obligation for Christians. The outcome of this was seen in the extraordinary scenes that took place soon after 1533 at Münster in Westphalia, where the Anabaptists, under John of Leyden, set up what can only be described as a parody of the Jewish commonwealth, which they termed the "New Jerusalem."[1] That the error was causing trouble in England also appears from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which it is expressly condemned, together with the entire rejection of the Old Testament.

"De iis, qui vetus Testamentum aut totum rejiciunt, aut totum exigunt. Deinde quomodo priscis temporibus Marcionitarum sordes, Valentinianorum et Manichæorum fluxerunt, et aliæ similes earum multæ fæces, a quibus vetus Testamentum ut absurdum malumque, et cum novo dissidens, repudiabatur, sic multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistæ præcipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis vetus Testamentum alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quæ in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes. Itaque nihil eorum ad nos statuunt pervenire debere. Aliorum autem contrarius est, sed ejusdem impietatis error, qui usque adeo vetus ad Testamentum adhærescunt, ut ad circumcisionem et a Mose quondam institutas ceremonias necessario nos revocent."[2]

The principal subjects to be considered in connection with this article are the following:—

1. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New.

[1] See Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii. p. 143 (Ed. Stubbs).

[2] *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæresibus*, ch. 4.

2. The old fathers did not look only for transitory promises.

3. The ceremonial and civil law of the Jews is not binding on Christians.

4. The moral law remains of lasting and universal obligation.

I. *The Old Testament is not contrary to the New.*

The statement of the Article on this subject is as follows: **The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.**

In the present day there is perhaps no probability of a revival of the view of many among the early Gnostics that the Old Testament is positively contrary to the New. Such a position could scarcely be taken up by anyone who started from the acceptance of the canon of the New Testament without mutilation. The several books of it are so interpenetrated with references and allusions to the Scriptures of the Jews, and the gospel is so manifestly built up upon the Old Dispensation that an actual contradiction between the two is almost inconceivable. But modern criticism has insisted so strongly on the inferiority of the Old Testament to the New, and has brought out into such strong relief the imperfection of the old system, that it may be well to point out that there is nothing in the article which calls us to deny this imperfection, or to maintain that the Old Testament is not inferior to the New. The general statements made in the article were clearly never intended to decide details of criticism or to bind the clergy who sign them to a particular view of the religious development of Israel.

The principle which our Lord Himself has taught us that some things were permitted under the Old Covenant "for the hardness of men's hearts"[1] admits of a wide range of application. But if the two dispensations are both from the same God they cannot be *contrary* the one to the other. That is the main point which the article is concerned to maintain, and room is left for whatever views the discoveries of criticism may establish or render probable as to the condition of Israel in early days, the origin of its sacred rites, and the course of its religious development.

Further, it will be noticed that the article bases the unity of the two Testaments on the hope of redemption through the Messiah, which is common to them both. The same position is maintained in the homilies. In the "second part of the homily of faith," the writer says of the "old fathers" that "although they were not named Christian men, yet it was a Christian faith that they had; for they looked for all benefits of God the Father through the merits of His Son Jesus Christ, as we now do. This difference is between them and us; for they looked when Christ should come, and we be in the time when He is come. Therefore saith S. Augustine, 'The time is altered and changed, but not the faith. For we have both one faith in one Christ.'"[2]

It is impossible that this can have been intended to suggest that all the "old fathers" had a clear knowledge of the "merits of Jesus Christ." Such an assertion would be quite unwarrantable. But it is a simple fact of history that, under the Old Covenant, there *did* in time grow up a very clear and definite expectation of a Messiah to come. In early days, no doubt, the hope

[1] S. Matt. xix. 8.

[2] The *Homilies*, p. 39 (Ed. S.P.C.K.). The reference to Augustine is to *In Joan.* Tract. xlv.

was but of an indefinite character, and there was little, if any, expectation of a *personal* deliverer. But as we follow out the course of the history we are able to see how the hope was gradually narrowed down to a race, a tribe, a family, and how it tended more and more to centre in a single person. To trace out the growth of this hope, and to mark its increasing definiteness, belongs to the province of the interpreter of the Old Testament rather than to that of the commentator on the Articles. The briefest outline must suffice here.

The earliest indication of the hope is found in the Protevangelium, immediately after the fall, when the promise was made that the "seed of the woman" should bruise the serpent's head.[1] After the flood it was not obscurely hinted that the blessing should come in the line of *Shem*.[2] The call of *Abraham*,[3] the choice of *Isaac* rather than Ishmael,[4] of *Jacob* rather than Esau,[5] narrowed down the line still more; while, whatever be the true interpretation of the words rendered in the English Bible 'till Shiloh come,' the exalted language used in the blessing of *Judah*, at the very least marks out this tribe for pre-eminence, and points to it as the one from which the promised blessings should be looked for.[6]

[1] Gen. iii. 15. "The Protevangelium is a faithful miniature of the entire history of humanity, a struggling seed ever battling for the ultimate victory. Here is the germinal idea which unfolds in the sufferings and sorrows, the hopes and joys of our race, until it is realised in the sublime victories of redemption."—C. A. Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 77.

[2] Gen. ix. 26, 27. All the commentators call attention to the significant fact that the name of the covenant God Jehovah occurs alone in the blessing of Shem.

[3] Gen. xii. 1–3.

[4] Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 4, xvii. 1–21.

[5] Gen. xxv. 23, cf. ch. xxvii.

[6] Gen. xlix. 9–12. The margin of the R.V. will show the English reader how doubtful is the rendering "till Shiloh come." There is really no support whatever for it from antiquity, and it probably rests on an

The choice of the house of David marks a fresh stage in the development of the hope. From the time of the great promise made to him in 2 Sam. vii., the consummation of the kingdom of God is connected with a king of the line of David, to whom God will be in a special way a "Father," and who shall be in a special way God's "Son." But even so, for some considerable period, the thought is rather of a *line of kings* than of one individual;[1] and not till the crisis of the Assyrian invasion in the eighth century do we find that the hope is definitely connected with the thought of a *personal* Messiah. In the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah we meet for the first time with detailed predictions, which point forward with unmistakeable clearness to a child who should be born, whose name should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace," and who should reign on the throne of David.[2] From this time onward, the evidence of the expectation of a personal Messiah is clear and decisive, and may be traced in the writings of the later prophets, both before and after the Captivity,[3] as well as in later

erroneous reading, שילה for שלה. The latter reading is implied in most of the ancient versions, and would give one or other of the following renderings: (1) "Till there come that which is his," or (2) "Till He come whose [it is]." In the latter case there is reference to a *personal* Messiah, whereas, if the former rendering be adopted, the clause must be regarded as an indeterminate expression of the Messianic hope. See, on the whole passage, S. R. Driver in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, vol. xiv. No. 27, and Spurrell's *Notes on Genesis*, p. 335 *seq.*

[1] That the thought is primarily of the *line* in the original promise in 2 Sam. vii. is shown by ver. 14. "I will be his father, and he shall be my son; if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men." It is impossible to apply these last words to the personal Messiah.

[2] See especially Isa. vii. 14, ix. 6, 7 and xi. 1–10; Micah iv. 8, v. 2–7.

[3] In Jeremiah there are the great prophecies of "the Branch" in xxiii. 5–8, and xxxiii. 14–26, and in Ezekiel there is the promise of "one Shepherd, even my servant David," ch. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; cf. ch.

Jewish writings, such as the Book of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon,[1] which never obtained admission within the canon.

Modern criticism may affect the interpretation of particular passages. It may show us that texts which were relied on by the older expositors as prophecies of the Messiah can no longer be appealed to with the same confidence as formerly. It may even involve a re-writing of the whole history of the Messianic hope. But the broad truth stated in the article will remain untouched by this, for the undeniable fact that, before the Incarnation, the fathers who lived under the Old Covenant had come to look for the "redemption of Israel," and were expecting a personal Messiah of the house of David is sufficient to justify the general statement that "both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man."

II. *The Old Fathers did not look only for Transitory Promises.*

Here again it can scarcely be thought that the article is designed to close the door to criticism on a subject on which widely different views have been held by devout scholars within the Church, namely, the belief of the Jews, under the Old Dispensation, in a future life beyond the grave. The statement that **they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises** can never have

xxi. 27, where there is a probable allusion to Gen. xlix. 10. In the prophets of the return from the Captivity, the clearest Messianic prophecies are those in Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, of "the Branch," which rest on the previous ones of Jeremiah. In Haggai ii. 6–9 the thought of a *personal* Messiah is not prominent. See the R.V. "the desirable things of all nations shall come," for "the desire" of the A.V.

[1] See the Book of Enoch, ch. xlv–lvii., which describes the coming of

been intended to compel us to maintain that the doctrine of a future life was clearly taught by Moses. We are expressly told in the New Testament that "life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel,"[1] and the whole tendency of modern criticism is to emphasise this by denying that there are sure and certain traces of a belief in a state of future bliss till a comparatively late period in the history of the Jews. It is patent to everyone that the promises of the Mosaic law, as a rule, refer exclusively to *this life* (see Ex. xx. 12, xxiii. 25–31; Levit. xxvi. etc.), and that length of days and temporal prosperity are the rewards contemplated in it. Moreover, it would seem that throughout the Old Testament, attention is for the most part concentrated on *this life*. It is "the land of the living" (see Ps. lii. 5; Isa. liii. 8; Jer. xi. 19, etc.). Death is regarded as an evil, and the dread of it is evident even among the best of the Hebrews, so that it has been said with some show of truth that they never spoke of death without a shudder (see Ps. lxxxviii. and Isa. xxxviii. in illustration of this). Nevertheless, while all this is admitted, it must not be forgotten that there is another side to it as well. Death is never regarded as *annihilation*. An existence *of some sort* after death is everywhere assumed in the Old Testament. Dathan and Abiram go down "alive" into Sheol (Num. xvi. 30). Jacob's anticipation that he will go down to Sheol to Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 35), and the familiar expression that a man was "gathered to his fathers," are evidences of a belief in a "something" beyond this life even in the

the chosen ruler of God, and ch. xc., where the Messiah is introduced under the figure of a white bullock. In the Psalms of Solomon, the Messiah of the house of David is spoken of in xvii. 23 *seq.* and xviii. 1–9, and is for the first time definitely called χριστὸς Κύριος.

[1] 2 Tim. i 10.

earliest days. But the state of the deceased, or the "shades,"[1] in Sheol or Hades, was in itself a state of unblessedness, not worthy to be called "life"; and only very gradually did the conception of a resurrection make its way among the Jews. What the pious Jew really looked for was life in and with God; that is the "eternal life" which is offered to mankind in both the Old and New Testaments alike. It has been truly said that "the antithesis in the psalmist's mind is not between life here and life hereafter (as we speak), but between life with and life without God; and for the moment, in the consciousness of the blessedness of fellowship with God, death fades from his view."[2] So by degrees the Jew who had come to believe in "the living God" and his own communion with Him, came at last to see that there was involved in this the doctrine of a future life, for the communion could not be broken by death. It is, however, often hard to say whether the union of the soul with God, after which the psalmists were feeling, was contemplated by them as consummated in this life or the next. Such Psalms as xvi., xvii., xlix., and lxxiii., which contain the most exalted language on this subject, have been variously interpreted. But even if we put it at the lowest, they contain "the germ and principle of the doctrine of the resurrection." Still, however we may interpret them, it is clear that the doctrine was no article of faith to the Jews. It formed no part of the creed of the Jewish Church. There could not be a better instance of the manner in which it was worked out by the individual than that given by the Book of

[1] רְפָאִים, the word is used for the εἴδωλα καμόντων in Job xxvi. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 11; Prov. ii. 18, ix. 18, xxi. 16; Isa. xiv. 9, xxvi. 14, 19. It signifies properly "relaxed" or "weak."

[2] Professor Kirkpatrick on the Psalms (Cambridge Bible), vol. ii. p. 274.

Job, which modern critics are inclined to regard as a late work, not earlier than the time of the Babylonish captivity. Had the doctrine of the resurrection formed a part of the traditional creed of the writer, it would not have been represented as only gradually dawning upon the mind of Job. Three distinct stages are apparent in his apprehension of it.

In chapter vii. there is utter disbelief in anything of the kind.

> "Oh remember that my life is wind:
> Mine eye shall no more see good.
> The eye of him that seeth me shall behold me no more:
> Thine eyes shall be upon me, but I shall not be.
> As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,
> So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more.
> He shall no more return to his house,
> Neither shall his place know him any more" (vers. 7–10).

In chapter xiv. the longing for a resurrection has arisen in Job's heart. He sees that nature points to one, and feels that if he could only look forward to one for himself, he could endure his present sufferings with greater calmness; but he is still very far from believing in one.

> "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
> And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
> Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
> And the stock thereof die in the ground;
> Yet through the scent of water it will bud,
> And put forth boughs like a plant.
> But man dieth, and wasteth away:
> Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
> As the waters fail from the sea,
> And the river decayeth and drieth up;
> So man lieth down and riseth not:
> Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
> Nor be roused out of their sleep.
> Oh that Thou wouldst hide me in Sheol,
> That Thou wouldst keep me secret, until Thy wrath be past,

That thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!
If a man die, shall he live again?
All the days of my warfare would I wait,
Till my release should come.
Thou shouldest call, and I would answer Thee:
Thou wouldest have a desire to the work of Thine hands"
(Vers. 7–15).

Finally, in chapter xix., he rises to the certainty that God will appear as his "vindicator," and that he shall be granted a vision of God after death.

"But I know that my redeemer liveth,
And that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth:
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,
Yet from my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another" (Vers. 25–27).[1]

There are other late passages in which the hope of a resurrection appears with unmistakeable clearness, such as Isaiah xxvi. 19: "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead."[2]

In the vision of "the dry bones" in Ezekiel xxxvii., though it is a *national* restoration that is primarily contemplated, yet some knowledge of the resurrection is presupposed, as otherwise the passage would be almost meaningless. Clearer still is Daniel xii. 2, which in-

[1] On this passage see A. B. Davidson's commentary in the *Cambridge Bible*, and cf. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 393. Both the English and the Scotch professor agree in seeing in the passage distinct intimation of a belief in a life beyond the grave. The translation given above is that of the R. V., but "redeemer" would be more properly "vindicator," and "from my flesh" probably signifies "apart from" or "deprived of" my flesh, not as it is understood in the A. V., "in my flesh."

[2] Modern critics generally assign this passage to a post-exilic date,

troduces most distinctly the idea of future retribution, and shows the highest point reached by the faithful under the old covenant:

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." [1]

That there was only some such gradual development of the belief, as has been thus briefly indicated, appears to be a most certain result of criticism. But, from what has been said, it will be evident that even from early days the way was prepared for the future doctrine, and in germ and principle it was there from the earliest day on which the Jew recognised God as *his* God, and felt that life in and with him was the supreme object of desire. When once he had grasped this, it could not be said that he "looked only for transitory promises." [2] Nor should it be forgotten that our Lord and His apostles teach us to see in the sayings of the Old Testament deeper and fuller meanings, unrecognised probably by those who first uttered or heard them. "That the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the place concerning the Bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him" (S. Luke xx. 37, 38). "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them, and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things

[1] See on all these passages Driver's *Sermons on the Old Testament*, Serm. 4, "Growth of Belief in a Future State."

[2] On this point see a remarkable letter in the *Life of F. D. Maurice*, vol. i. p. 396.

make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own. And if, indeed, they had been mindful of that country from which they went out, they would have had the opportunity to return. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city" (Heb. xi. 13–16).

It has never been seriously maintained that these passages decide once for all the question of the actual amount of knowledge concerning a future state possessed by the Jews, and since the article certainly says no more than they do, we may rest assured that it leaves us free to decide the critical question on critical grounds. And it may be added that it is a remarkable fact that when the reformers put forth the first book of the *Homilies* containing a sermon "On the Dread of Death," they could apparently find no passage to quote from the Old Testament for the belief of the Jews in a life of bliss after death earlier than the Book of Wisdom, on which, therefore, they fell back, appealing to it as "Scripture," and citing it as establishing the point in question.

"Now, the holy fathers of the old law, and all faithful and righteous men which departed before our Saviour Christ's ascension into heaven, did by death depart from troubles into rest; from the hands of their enemies into the hands of God; from sorrows and sicknesses unto joyful refreshing, into Abraham's bosom, a place of all comfort and consolation, as Scriptures do plainly by manifest words testify. The Book of Wisdom saith, *That the righteous men's souls be in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them. They seemed to the eyes of foolish men to die; and their death was counted miserable, and their departing out of this world wretched; but they be in rest.* And another place saith, *That the righteous shall live for ever, and their reward is with the Lord, and*

their minds be with God, who is above all; therefore they shall receive a glorious kingdom, and a beautiful crown at the Lord's hand. And in another place the same book saith, The righteous, though he be prevented *with sudden death, nevertheless he shall be there, where he shall be refreshed.*"[1]

The remaining subjects in connection with this article admit of the briefest possible treatment.

III. *The Ceremonial and Civil Law of the Jews is not binding on Christians.*

In proof of the assertion that **the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men,** it is sufficient to refer to the account of the Apostolic Council held at Jerusalem to settle this very subject, when it was once for all decided that circumcision was not to be enforced on Gentile converts (Acts xv.), and to the whole line of argument in S. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, in which he vindicates the liberty of Christians from the burden of the law; while since **the civil precepts** of the Mosaic code were never imposed on any nation but the Jews, it cannot be supposed that they **ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.**

IV. *The Moral Law remains of Universal and Lasting Obligation.*

If proof is wanted for the statement that **no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral,** it may be found in our Lord's assertion that he came "not

[1] The third part of the Homily of the "Fear of Death," p. 103 (Ed. S.P.C.K.). The references are to *Wisdom*, iii. 1–3, v. 15, 16, and iv. 7.

to destroy the law, but to fulfil" (S. Matt. v. 17); in the special teaching of the sermon on the mount, in which the moral law is enforced, explained, and expanded (S. Matt. v. 21–48); in the reply to the question concerning "the great commandment" (S. Matt. xxii. 37–40); and in the frequent insistence on the duties of the moral law in S. Paul's Epistles (see especially Rom. xiii. 8–10).

ARTICLE VIII

De Tribus Symbolis.

Symbola tria, Nicænum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur omnino recipienda sunt et credenda. Nam firmissimis scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

Of the Three Creeds.

The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

THERE has been but little alteration in this article since 1553. At the revision of 1563 the words "and believed" (*et credenda*) were inserted; and in 1571 in Latin the word *Apostolorum* was substituted for the adjective *Apostolicum*, which had stood there previously.

With the languuge of the article may be compared that of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* :—

"Et quoniam omnia ferme, quæ ad fidem spectant Catholicam, tum quoad beatissimam Trinitatem, tum quoad mysteria nostræ redemptionis, tribus Symbolis, hoc est, Apostolico, Niceno, et Athanasii, breviter continentur; idcirco ista tria Symbola, ut fidei nostræ compendia quædam, recipimus et amplectimus, quod firmissimis divinarum et canonicarum scripturarum testimoniis facile probari possint."[1]

An article on this subject asserting definitely the adherence of the Church of England to the ancient creeds of the Church Catholic was rendered necessary

[1] *Ref. Legum. Eccl.* "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," ch. 5.

by the spread of Anabaptism, the leaders of which utterly ignored and set aside these summaries of the faith, together with the faith itself contained in them.

The subjects to be considered in connection with this article are four in number :—

1. Creeds in general.
2. The Apostles' Creed.
3. The Nicene Creed.
4. The Athanasian Creed.

I. *Of Creeds in General.*

The origin of creeds must be sought in the baptismal service of the Church. Our Lord's command to His apostles had been to make disciples of all nations by baptizing them into the name

(1) Of the Father;
(2) Of the Son;
(3) Of the Holy Ghost.

Hence comes the threefold division of all the ancient creeds,[1] referring to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, and their work. In consequence of this command we find that from the earliest times some profession of faith was required from candidates for baptism, and that for this purpose short summaries of the main doctrines of Christianity were drawn up. It is possible to see in some passages of the New Testament indications of regular formularies in use even in apostolic days. Thus the statement in 1 Cor. viii. 6 looks very much like a reminiscence of one such :—

"To us there is *one God the Father*, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and *one Lord Jesus*

[1] The Athanasian Creed is, of course, an exception, but it is scarcely a creed. It should be regarded rather as an *Expositio Fidei*, or even as a Canticle.

Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him." [1]

So the summary in 1 Tim. iii. 16 is commonly thought to contain a fragment of an early creed or hymn—

> " He who was manifested in the flesh,
> Justified in the Spirit,
> Seen of angels,
> Preached among the nations,
> Believed on in the world,
> Received up in glory."

Again, according to the received text of Acts viii. 37, when the Ethiopian eunuch says, " See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized ? " Philip's answer is, " If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Whereupon the eunuch makes his profession of faith: " I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." These words are, however, universally regarded as an interpolation. They were probably inserted in order to bring the account into harmony with the requirements of the baptismal service. They cannot, therefore, be appealed to as a witness of the apostolic age, but as the interpolation was made before the days of Irenæus (A.D. 180), who quotes the whole passage with the inserted words,[2] it may fairly be taken as a witness to the practice of the Church somewhere about the middle of the second century. About the close of this century we meet with a definite statement in the writings of Tertullian, that the profession of faith required at baptism was somewhat amplified from the simple form of belief in the threefold name enjoined in the Gospel.[3] And since, even earlier than this, several writers,[4] when summing up the faith of the Church, give it in a form closely corresponding to the creeds used later

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. [2] Irenæus, Bk. III. xii. 10 ; cf. IV. xxxvii. 2.

[3] *De Corona Militis*, ch. iii.: " Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit."

[4] *E.g.* Ignatius, *Ep. ad Trall.* ch. ix.

on, and appear to be alluding to something like a fixed formulary, it is more natural to suppose that they are definitely alluding to the creed, than to think that the creed was subsequently developed from the summaries of the rule of faith as given by them. Thus it is now generally acknowledged that traces of, and allusions to, the creed may be found in such early writers as Aristides and Justin Martyr (*circa* 140), as well as in Irenæus and Tertullian. The creed of the first-mentioned writer as collected from his *Apology*, and restored by Professor Rendel Harris, runs as follows :—

> "We believe in one God, Almighty,
> Maker of heaven and earth ;
> And in Jesus Christ His Son
> Born of the Virgin Mary ;
> He was pierced by the Jews :
> He died and was buried ;
> The third day He rose again :
> He ascended into heaven ;
> He is about to come to judge."[1]
> . . . . . .

Even if we cannot feel quite certain of the details in all cases there is no longer room for doubt that formal creeds were in use by the middle of the second century, varying to some extent in different churches, but all following the same general outline, and all alike based on the baptismal formula, with its threefold reference to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.[2] In the fourth century our knowledge of creeds became much fuller. At

[1] *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. p. 25 (Ed. J. A. Robinson).

[2] The "rules of faith" as given by Tertullian, Irenæus, and others may be found in Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole*. One from Tertullian is added here as a specimen. *De Virg. Vel.* 1. "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia dia resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris,

that time the practice of the Church was for the candidates for baptism to be carefully prepared beforehand and instructed in the main doctrines of the Church by one of the presbyters especially appointed for the purpose. A few days before the actual baptism the formal creed of the Church into which they were to be baptized was taught to them, and an exposition of it in the form of a sermon on it delivered before them. This was called the "delivery of the Creed," *Traditio Symboli.* At the time of the actual baptism they were interrogated as to their belief,[1] and required to return answer to the priest's question in the form of the creed which they had received, and which they were now to "give back" at this *Redditio Symboli.*[2] After baptism the creed was preserved in the memory as a convenient summary, written on the heart, but not committed to paper;[3] nor was it till a somewhat later period used in any other service of the Church.[4]

venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem." Other passages such as *Adv. Prax.* 2, and *De Præscript.* 13, show that Tertullian's Creed contained also the article on the Holy Spirit.

[1] In this way there grew up the interrogative creeds of the Church, such as that found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, p. 86, 116 (Ed. Wilson). Other forms are given in Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 106 *seq.* It would appear that sometimes a shorter form was used at the *Redditio Symboli* than had been rehearsed to the catechumens at the *Traditio.*

[2] Cf. Lumby's *History of the Creeds*, p. 11 *seq.* The famous Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem were delivered to candidates for baptism in the year 347 or 348. Cyril nowhere gives the creed continuously, but it can easily be collected from Lectures vi.–xviii. See Hahn, *op. cit.* p. 62.

[3] See Augustine's *Sermo ad Catechumenos*, which was delivered at the *Traditio Symboli*, and begins as follows: "Accipite, filii, regulam fidei, quod symbolum dicitur. Et cum acceperitis, in corde scribite, et quotidie dicite apud vos: antequam dormiatis, antequam procedatis, vestro symbolo vos munite. Symbolum nemo scribit ut legi possit, sed ad recensendum, ne forte deleat oblivio quod tradidit diligentia, sit vobis codex vestra memoria. Quod audituri estis, hoc crediturí; et quod credideritis, hoc etiam lingua reddituri."—*Opera.* tom. vi. col. 547.

[4] The first to introduce the creed into the Liturgy was Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch soon after 470. Constantinople followed about 510.

Another use of creeds comes prominently before us in connection with the controversies of the fourth century. From the date of the Council of Nicæa onwards we meet with them as *tests of orthodoxy*, accepted by Councils, and offered for signature to those members of the Church, the correctness of whose faith was called in question; and as time went on, and new heresies arose, amplified and enlarged with the express purpose of guarding against fresh errors.

Hence we get two different kinds of creeds—(1) the baptismal profession, which, as made by the individual, runs in the first person singular, *I believe;* and (2) Conciliar creeds, which, as containing the faith of the assembled fathers, were naturally couched in the first person plural, *We believe.* In course of time, however, when the creeds were introduced into the public services of the Church, we find that the East for the most part adopted the plural, and the West the singular, whether the creed was conciliar or baptismal in its origin,[1] and thus the distinction was almost obliterated, although it can be clearly traced in all the earlier forms.[2]

In the West, Spain led the way in 589. The Gallican and Anglican Churches adopted it in the seventh or eighth century; Rome not till the eleventh. There is no certain indication of the use of the creed in the hour services of the Church before the *ninth* century, when it is ordered to be used at Prime.

[1] Thus the Western Church has *altered* the Constantinopolitan Creed, and uses the singular in it "I believe," whereas the original Greek text has naturally enough the plural πιστεύομεν.

[2] Eastern creeds in the singular may be found in the Liturgy of S. James, the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VII. xli.), and the Coptic Liturgy. S. Cyril also has the singular in *Cat.* xix. 9, though elsewhere his words seem to imply the use of the plural. Cf. Hahn, p. 62. Western creeds in the plural are those of Augustine and pseudo-Augustine, as restored by Hahn, pp. 30, 31 (Heurtley, however, restores the singular, *Credo*); of Facundus of Hermiane (*ibid.* p. 34); pseudo-Ambrose (p. 43); and, as is only natural, the professions of several Councils, *e.g.* of Toledo, A.D. 400 and 589.

There are further differences between the creeds as ultimately formulated in the East and West respectively, which are owing to the different types and characters of the churches in different parts of the world. These may be briefly summed up as follows, and illustrated from the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, taken as typical specimens of Eastern and Western creeds.

(*a*) The Eastern creeds are more *dogmatic*, the Western more *historic*. "In the Eastern creeds, to use a modern form of expression, the 'ideas' of Christianity predominate: in the Western creeds the 'facts' of Christianity stand out in their absolute simplicity."[1] Thus in the Nicene (Eastern) Creed it will be noticed that *reasons* for the facts are sometimes given, and not only is the question *what* is to be believed answered, but the question *why* receives a reply as well. It was *for us men and for our salvation* that He "came down from heaven." He "was crucified also *for us* under Pontius Pilate." He rose again the third day, *according to the Scriptures.* We are baptized *for the remission of sins.* There is nothing whatever corresponding to the clauses marked in italics to be found in any Western creed.

(*b*) The Eastern creeds always insert "One" before God, and add "Maker of heaven and earth." These last words, though now found in the Apostles' Creed, were, as will presently be shown, the very last words to find their way into it, not appearing till the seventh century. The reason for these additional phrases in the East is obvious. In the presence of much philosophical dualism, and of the wild speculations of many among the Gnostic sects, with their theories of the eternity of matter, and of a "Demiurge" or Creator distinct from the supreme God, the doctrine of the unity of God, and of the creation of all things, possessed a dogmatic importance in

[1] Bishop Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 187.

the speculative East, which was wanting in the practical West.[1]

(*c*) The Eastern creeds dwell at greater length on the details of our Lord's nature and work before the Incarnation, and of His suffering, but never have the clause, "He descended into hell." The Apostles' Creed after the clause, "And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord," passes straight to the Incarnation, "Who was conceived," etc. The Nicene piles clause upon clause to insist on our Lord's divinity, and adds that "By Him all things were made," before saying that He "came down from heaven, and was incarnate," etc.

(*d*) No Eastern creed has "the Communion of Saints," while no Western creed mentions the "One Baptism" in connection with the remission of sins.[2]

Of the names for the creed in use in the ancient Church the commonest is *Symbolum* or *Σύμβολον*. This is used in both East and West, and applied not only to the Baptismal Creed, but also to the Nicene Creed as well, though this latter is also frequently termed *ἡ πίστις*. The word *Symbolum*, as applied to the creed, is met with for the first time in the writings of S. Cyprian about the middle of the third century. It is used by him more

[1] Since both Irenæus (representing Gaul), and Tertullian (representing Africa), repeatedly give the rule of faith as including belief in *One* God, who is the Maker of all things, it would seem probable that these phrases were originally found in the Western creed, but were suffered to drop out of it in the course of time, as the practical need for their insertion was not felt. See Irenæus I. ii. 1; III. iv. 1; IV. liii. 1, and Tertullian *De virg. vel.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 2; *De Præscript.* 13. The rule of faith as given by Novatian has simply *in Deum Patrem*, and apparently takes *Omnipotentem* as implying the creation of all things. "Omnipotentem, id est verum omnium perfectissimum conditorem." See Hahn, p. 4.

[2] Bishop Westcott, *op. cit.* Note iii. The Gallican Creed quoted below may perhaps be considered an exception, as it does mention baptism in connection with the forgiveness of sins.

than once,[1] and from his day forward is of frequent occurrence. Some doubt has been felt concerning the origin of the name and its exact significance in this connection. Various theories have been proposed in order to explain its use, some of which fall to the ground at once when it is recognised that *σύμβολον* is really a distinct word from *συμβολή*, and that the latter word is never used of the creed. This enables us to set aside at once the theory which Rufinus mentions,[2] and which is adopted by many of the Latin Fathers, that the creed is a "collation" or epitome of Christian doctrine, made up of the "contributions" of the twelve apostles. This theory was improved upon in later times, until the creed was shown to consist of twelve articles, one having been contributed by each of the twelve apostles.[3] Apart from all other objections these views labour under the fatal mistake of confusing two quite distinct Greek words, and may be dismissed without further consideration. The true view of the origin of the term is probably that which gives it the meaning of "watchword."

[1] *E.g. Ep.* lxix. 7.

[2] *In Symb.* § 2. "Symbolum autem hoc multis et justissimis ex causis appellari voluerunt. Symbolum enim Græce et indicium dici potest et collatio, hoc est, quod plures in unum conferunt. Id enim fecerunt Apostoli in his sermonibus in unum conferendo unusquisque quod sentit." Cf. Cassian, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, VI. iii.

[3] Such a creed is found at the end of the *Sacramentorium Gallicanum*, which dates perhaps from the seventh century. "Petrus dixit: Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Johannes dixit: Credo in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Deum et Dominum nostrum. Jacobus dixit: Natum de Maria Virgine per Spiritum Sanctum. Andreas dixit: Passum sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixum et sepultum. Philippus dixit: Descendit ad inferna. Thomas dixit: Tertia die resurrexit. Bartholomæus dixit: Ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Dei patris omnipotentis. Matthæus dixit: Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Jacobus Alphæi dixit: Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Simon Zelotes dixit: Credo in Ecclesiam Sanctam. Judas Jacobi dixit: Per Baptismum sanctum remissionem peccatorum. Matthias dixit: Carnis resurrectionem in vitam æternam. Amen." See Migne, vol. lxxii. p. 580.

It was the watchword of the Christian soldier, carefully and jealously guarded by him, as that by which he himself could be distinguished from heretics, and that for which he could challenge others, of whose orthodoxy he might be in doubt.[1]

Another term frequently found in connection with the creed is *regula fidei.* This is, however, not confined to the creed. It signifies the *credenda* or main doctrines of the Church rather than the precise form of words in which those doctrines were summed up. Thus we find that the same writer will give us the *regula fidei* in slightly different terms in different parts of his work; and though Augustine in his *Sermo ad Catechumenos,* quoted in a note on a previous page,[2] identifies the *regula* with the *Symbolum,* yet the former sometimes occurs in such a connection as to make it clear that its meaning is wider than that of the latter, and that it is not quite correct to regard the two as strictly convertible terms.

II. *The Apostles' Creed.*

The Apostles' Creed, in the *exact* form in which it is

[1] Rufinus (*l.c.*) gives this as one of the reasons for which the Creed was termed *Symbolum.* "Indicium autem vel signum idcirco dicitur quia in illo tempore sicut et Paulus Apostolus dicit, et in Actibus Apostolorum refertur, multi ex circumeuntibus Judæis simulabant se esse Apostolos Christi, et lucri alicujus vel ventris gratia ad prædicandum proficiscebantur, nominantes quidem Christum sed non integris traditionum lineis nunciantes. Idcirco, istud indicium posuere, per quod agnosceretur is qui Christum vere secundum Apostolicas regulas prædicaret. Denique et in bellis civilibus hoc observari ferunt: quoniam et armorum habitus par, et sonus vocis idem, et mos unus est, atque eadem instituta bellandi, ne qua doli subreptio fiat, symbola distincta unusquisque dux suis militibus tradit quæ Latine signa vel indicia nuncupantur; ut si forte occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus symbolum, prodat si sit hostis vel socius. Idcirco denique hæc non scribi chartulis aut membranis, sed retineri credentium cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset, hæc neminem ex lectione, quæ interdum pervenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex Apostolorum traditione didicisse."

[2] See p. 300, note 3.

familiar to us, is in all probability the latest of the three creeds, although *in general expression* it is the oldest, and the freest from terms inserted for the express purpose of emphasising and guarding the true faith against heresies.

It is strictly a Western creed, being unknown in the East,[1] and the Greek copies of it which exist in MSS. are of late date, and bear evident marks of being translations from the Latin.[2] In the form in which we have it, it represents the ultimate form taken by the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, and is developed from the older creed of the Roman Church.

This Roman Creed we meet with for the first time in the year 341, when it is given in a letter written by Marcellus of Ancyra to Julius, Bishop of Rome. Marcellus was accused, not without good reason, of something very like Sabellianism, and wrote to Julius to defend himself. The letter, which is preserved by Epiphanius, is in Greek, but there can be no doubt that the creed which Marcellus gives as the expression of his own belief is really the creed of the Church of Rome. With the exception of two phrases, it is identical with the Roman Creed described in the work of Rufinus some fifty years later. Marcellus omits the word "Father" in the first article, and adds "the life everlasting" at the close. Otherwise the two creeds are identical. By the help, then, of these two documents, the letter of Marcellus, and the exposition of the creed by Rufinus, we can recover the text of the old Roman Creed as it stood

[1] At the Council of Florence (1439) the Greeks expressly denied all knowledge of it, *ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔχομεν οὔτε εἴδομεν τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων*. See Swainson, *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 153.

[2] The Greek copy in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, referred to by Pearson, is now assigned to the fifteenth century.

in the fourth century. It may be reconstructed as follows:—

"I believe in God [the Father] Almighty,
And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,
Who was born of the Holy Ghost from the Virgin Mary,
Was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried,
The third day He rose again from the dead,
He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father,
Thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead,
And in the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the forgiveness of sins,
The resurrection of the flesh." [1]

Three questions present themselves for consideration: (1) Can this creed be traced to an earlier date than the

[1] The Greek as given by Marcellus (Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxii.) is the following:—*πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν παντοκράτορα καὶ εἰς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* The Latin of Rufinus runs thus: "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum. Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus. Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem." So Hahn, p. 13. But the text of Rufinus has the ablative throughout, *in Deo Patre*, etc. With regard to the two variations noticed above in the text, the other authorities for this old Roman form of the creed agree with Rufinus as against Marcellus. Though the latter omits *Patrem*, as does Tertullian in giving the rule of faith, yet the word is found in Novatian's rule of faith, as also in Cyprian (*Ep.* lxix.), as well as in three MSS., two of which give the same creed as formerly used in England (Brit. Museum, Royal, 2 A. xx; Galba, A. xviii. [where the creed is given in Greek]), and one of Sardinian origin (Bodleian, Codex Laud. Gr. 35). These three MSS. also agree with Rufinus in omitting *vitam æternam*, and moreover S. Jerome expressly says that the creed ends with "the resurrection of the flesh."—*Contr. Joannem Hieros ad. Pammach.* § 28. The African Creed, however, as early as the days of S. Cyprian, had the clause "vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam." But there can be no doubt that it has rightly no place in the old Roman form.

fourth century? (2) When and where were the additions made which transformed it into its present form? (3) How came the fuller form to be substituted for the old Roman text?

1. With regard to the first of these, it is now generally admitted that the creed must have taken shape *not later than the middle of the second century.* The ground for believing this is the fact that in writers of other Western churches, from the latter part of the second century onwards, we can trace allusions and references to creeds which are very similar to, and apparently derived from, the Roman Creed. "All the Western provincial creeds," says Harnack, "are evidently offshoots of the Roman," and thus, to quote the same writer, "we may regard it as an assured result of research that the old Roman Creed came into existence about, or shortly before, the middle of the second century."[1]

2. In considerating the second question just raised, we note that the words and phrases wanting in the old Roman Creed, which are found in the current text of it, are these:—

1. Maker of heaven and earth.
2. Who was conceived.
3. Suffered.
4. Dead.
5. Descended into hell.
6. God . . . Almighty, in the article "Sitteth at the right hand."
7. Catholic.
8. The Communion of Saints.
9. The life everlasting.

Of these, one or two were already in use elsewhere, although not in Rome, before the close of the fourth century. We have already seen that "descended into

[1] *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, translated in the *Nineteenth Century*, July 1893, p. 162.

hell" was found at Aquileia in the time of Rufinus, though not at Rome, and that "the life everlasting" was adopted in very early days in the African Church. It would also seem possible that "suffered" had found its way into the African Creed before the days of Augustine.[1] But though one or two articles thus appear here and there at an earlier date, there can be no doubt that the bulk of the additions first secured a fixed position in the creed in Gaul during the fifth century, and that the Apostles' Creed, as we know it, is *a Gallican recension of the old Roman Creed.* For the creed of the Gallican Church, during the fifth and early part of the sixth century, we have three principal authorities, Faustus of Riez (*circa* 480),[2] Cæsarius of Arles (470-542),[3] and his friend and contemporary Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon.[4] From these three writers we can see that by the close of the fifth century the Gallican Church had received the words "who was conceived," "suffered," "catholic," "the communion of saints," and "the life everlasting." It is possible that "descended into hell," had already found its way from the Aquileian into the Gallican Creed.[5] There is some reason also

[1] *Passus* is not given in the creed commented on in *De fide et Symbolo, De Genesi ad literam, opus imperf.*, or the *Enchiridion.* It appears, however, to have found a place in the creeds of the *Sermo de Symbolo ad Catech.*, and of Sermon ccxii.; cf. Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 40.

[2] See Hahn, p. 39, and cf. *Fausti Reiensis Opera* (Ed. Engebrecht), *Ep.* 7, and *De Spiritu Sancto*, 1, 2.

[3] That is, if the sermon in the Appendix to vol. v. of Augustine (Serm. ccxliv.) is rightly assigned to him, as it is by several authorities after the Benedictines.

[4] In his letter to Bishop Maximus, of Geneva, first printed by Gundlach in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Hist. Epistolæ ævi Merovingici.*

[5] It is found in the sermon assigned to Cæsarius, but is not in the creed given by Cyprian of Toulon. There may be a *possible* reference to the creed in Faustus, Serm. ii., "Mortem suscepit, pretioso nos sanguine liberavit, *ad inferna descendit.*"

for thinking that "dead" was already received in Gaul.[1] At any rate, both these clauses are found there shortly afterwards. And the same holds good of the remaining phrases, namely, "Maker of heaven and earth," and "God . . . Almighty" in the Sixth Article, for these are all found in the creed as given in the *Gallican Sacramentary*, assigned to the middle of the seventh century.[2] There are, however, slight variations between this creed and the text as now received, and the first writer to give the creed in *precisely* the words which the whole Western Church has since adopted is Pirminius, or Priminius, a bishop who laboured in France and Germany about the middle of the eighth century. In a treatise of his entitled "Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus,"[3] we find the legend attributing the composition of the creed to the twelve apostles, and the form given is word for word the same as that with which we are familiar.[4] On the day of Pentecost, when the apostles were gathered together—"There appeared unto them divided tongues of fire, and sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the

[1] *Mortuus* is also found in the Creed of Cæsarius, and may have been in that of Faustus. If the sermons formerly assigned to Eusebius Gallus really belong to Faustus, he would seem to have read "was crucified, *dead*, and buried," exactly as we have the words at present. See on this, and generally on "The Early Creed of the Gallican Church," a paper by the Rev. A. E. Burn in the *Guardian* for March 1895, containing the results of the latest researches on the subject.

[2] See the *Missale Gallicanum* in Migne, vol. lxxii. col. 349. Precisely the same creed is given in *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, *ibid.* col. 489, and, as Heurtley points out, "the occurrence of the same form in two independent documents would seem to imply that they were to some extent established."—*Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 69.

[3] *Scarapsus* is explained as equivalent to *collectus*. But Heurtley suggests that it may be only a misreading for *scriptus*, *Op. cit.* p. 70.

[4] The whole extract is printed by Dr. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 103.

Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance: and they composed the creed. Peter: "*I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.* John: *And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.* James said: *Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.* Andrew said: *Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.* Philip said: *Descended into hell.* Thomas said: *The third day He rose from the dead.* Bartholomew said: *He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.* Matthew said: *From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* James, the son of Alphæus, said: *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* Simon Zelotes said: *The Holy Catholic Church.* Jude, the brother of James, said: *The communion of saints.* Also Thomas said: *The resurrection of the flesh,*[1] *the life everlasting.*"

The various additions, the earliest appearance of which has been now indicated, with one exception can scarcely have been made with the definite purpose of guarding against heresies. "The Communion of Saints" perhaps *was* added as an answer to the Donatist charge that there was in the Church a *communio malorum*, to which Augustine had replied, "that though in the Church the evil were mingled with the good, and the Church was to that extent a mixed body, there was

[1] It is strange that our reformers should have rendered *resurrectionem carnis* by "the resurrection of *the body*," in the translation of the creed, appointed to be recited at Matins, first printed in full in 1552, and in the Catechism (1549), whereas in the Office for Public Baptism (1549), it is correctly rendered "the resurrection of *the flesh*." The form of words is certainly non-scriptural, but it was "necessary in order to safeguard scriptural truth," and was probably adopted by the Church in order to guard against Gnostic subtilty, which could accept "the resurrection of *the dead*," but explain it away, as if it referred to baptism or a spiritual awakening. See Tertullian, *De Resur. Carnis*, 19, and cf. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 89 *seq.*

within her a true *communio sanctorum*, in which the evil have no part, and which is not impaired by their presence."[1] But the other clauses of comparatively late introduction are rather the natural amplifications to which such a document would be subject in course of time (especially if used for catechetical purposes), expressing with great fulness of detail what was already implied in the briefer form previously in use. It may also be remarked that in some points the Nicene Creed represents an *older* type than the Apostles', not having received all of these later amplifications. For instance, to this day there is no mention of our Lord's death in the Nicene Creed. It is, of course, *implied* in the words, "He suffered and was buried," but the formal statement of the fact contained in the word "dead" is wanting; nor are the words "God . . . Almighty" found in the clause on the session "at the right hand of the Father."

3. The third question raised above was this: How came the fuller form (which we have now seen to be of Gallican origin) to be substituted for the old Roman Creed? It is generally thought that, owing to the prevalence of Arianism among the Teutonic invaders of Italy from the latter part of the fifth century onwards, the Roman Church adopted the use of the Nicene Creed at baptism,[2] instead of her ancient formula, in order the more effectually to exclude the Arians, who, while willing to accept the Apostles' Creed, would be definitely shut out by the more explicit form now tendered to them.[3] The

[1] Swete, *op. cit.* p. 83, where there is a reference to Augustine, *C. Epist. Parmenian.* ii. 37, and *De Bapt. c. Donatist.* ii. 8, v. 38, vii. 49. It is, however, the *thought* rather than the actual phrase *communio sanctorum*, which is Augustinian.

[2] This seems to be shown by its appearance in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* at the *Traditio Symboli*, p. 53 (Ed. Wilson).

[3] This is the view, *e.g.*, of Harnack.

old Roman Creed, however, still continued to be used in the provinces, notably in Gaul, where it received the additions which brought it to its present form, and whence it was reintroduced into Rome, *circa* 800, under the influence of Charlemagne. Further, it has been suggested that the old Roman Creed, even though deposed from liturgical honours, survived as a form of instruction, and was still used there in the days of Gregory the Great, so that it was brought into England by Augustine, and continued to be used in this country [1] until the Norman Conquest drew tighter the bonds of union with Rome, and led to the sole use of the creed in the fuller form which Rome, in common with the other churches of the West, had already adopted.[2]

Before leaving the subject of this creed, it remains to consider the origin of the name, which it has borne for centuries—the Apostles' Creed. The name was originally given to the old Roman Creed, and appears, so far as is

[1] Its use here would seem to be implied by its existence in the British Museum MSS. noted above, p. 307.

[2] See Swete, p. 13 *seq.*, where it is pointed out that the fuller form was certainly known (though apparently not exclusively used) in England before the Norman Conquest: "Traces of it may be seen in English Episcopal professions of the ninth century, and it is found with an interlinear translation in a Lambeth MS. of the same period" (No. 427). Its influence is also seen in the remarkable creed contained in the *Bangor Antiphonary*, which comes from Ireland, and belongs to the seventh century: "Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, invisibilem, omnium creaturarum visibilium et invisibilium conditorem. Credo et in Jhesum Christum filium ejus unicum, dominum nostrum Deum Omnipotentem, conceptum de Spiritu Sancto, natum de Maria Virgine, passum sub Pontio Pylato, qui crucifixus et sepultus discendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlis, seditque ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis, exinde venturus judicare vivos ac mortuos. Credo et in Spiritum Sanctum Deum Omnipotentem, unam habentem substantiam cum Patre et filio, sanctam esse ecclesiam Catholicam, abremissa peccatorum, sanctorum communionem, carnis resurrectionem. Credo vitam post mortem et vitam æternam in gloria Christi."—*Antiphonary of Bangor*, fol. 19 (Ed. Warren).

known, for the first time, in the writings of S. Ambrose.[1] S. Jerome also speaks of the symbol of faith "which was delivered by the apostles";[2] and Rufinus, like S. Ambrose, considers the creed to have been actually drawn up by the apostles.[3] The later form of the tradition, which divides the creed into twelve articles, assigning one to each of the twelve apostles, needs no serious notice. It is sufficiently refuted by the simple fact that some of the articles were demonstrably wanting in the creed for centuries. Nor, in the face of the silence of the Acts of the Apostles and all authorities prior to the close of the fourth century, is it reasonable to maintain that the actual form of words found in the old Roman Creed was really drawn up by the apostles. It is, however, quite possible that the name of the Apostles' Creed may have been given to it in consequence of the erroneous belief that it was their work. But, on the other hand, it is equally probable that the *name* may have given rise to the *belief*, rather than the *belief* have suggested the *name*. The adjective, "apostolic," was largely used by early writers as denoting that that to which it was applied came substantially from the apostles. Thus, such expressions as "the apostolic tradition," or "apostolic preaching," did not imply that the words were "apostolic," but only that the substance was such. So, "the Apostolic Creed"[4] would denote

[1] "Epistola Concilii Mediolanensis," *Opera*, v. p. 292.

[2] "Ad Pammach. c. Joann. Hier." *Opera*, ii. col. 380. "Symbolum fidei . . . quod ab apostolis traditum."

[3] *In Symbolum*, § 2, where it is introduced as a tradition of the elders, "Tradunt majores nostri, etc."

[4] The definite title, "Symbolum Apostolorum," is certainly used by S. Ambrose, and in the "Epistola Concilii Mediolanensis," which was possibly drawn up by him, see *Opera*, vol. v. p. 292. But, as a general rule, in older MSS. "Symbolum *Apostolicum*" is the form found. "Symbolum Apostolorum" occurs in the *Bangor Antiphonary* of the seventh century, and in most later documents.

that the creed contained the faith of the apostles, not that the *ipsissima verba* were due to them. In process of time the belief arose that the words, as well as the substance, came from the apostles, and finally the medieval legend took definite form and shape, and was unhesitatingly received throughout the whole of the Western Church until the Reformation in the sixteenth century. A third explanation of the name has been suggested. The creed, as we have seen, was the creed of the Roman Church. This was the only Church in the West which was founded by an apostle, and was emphatically termed "the Apostolic See" (*Sedes Apostolica*). Hence the creed, as being that of the Apostolic See, was termed the Apostolic Creed. This view is certainly a possible one, but it is believed that one or other of the two former explanations of the origin of the name is more probable.

Subjoined is the text of the creed in the original Latin, as formerly used in this country.[1]

Symbolum Apostolorum.

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ. Et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus unicum Dominum nostrum. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine. Passus sub Pontio Pylato, crucifixus mortuus et sepultus. Descendit ad inferna:[2] tertia die resurrexit a mortuis. Ascendit ad cœlos: sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam.

[1] *Brevarium ad usum Sarum* (Cambridge reprint of the edition of 1531), *Psalterium*, col. 2.

[2] The *Roman Breviary*, like the *Bangor Antiphonary*, and most later MSS. has *inferos*.

Sanctorum Communionem. Remissionem peccatorum Carnis resurrectionem. Vitam æternam. Amen.[1]

III. *The Nicene Creed.*

In tracing out the history of the (so-called) Nicene Creed, the starting-point must be the Council of Nicæa, in the year 325.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, in writing an account of the proceedings to his flock shortly afterwards,[2] states that he himself proposed to the Council the creed of his own Church of Cæsarea, which he had received from the bishops who preceded him, and which he had professed at his baptism. It ran as follows :—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible;

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the Only Begotten Son, the Firstborn of all creation; begotten of God the Father before all worlds; by whom also all

[1] Much has been written in recent years upon the creeds in general, and more especially upon the Apostles' Creed. The works of Dr. Lumby (1873) and Swainson (1875) are frequently referred to in the notes. Besides these, the collections of Heurtley (*Harmonia Symbolica*, 1858) and Hahn (*Bibliothek der Symbole*, 1877) will be found most valuable, as well as the great works of Caspari (*Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, 1870–1875; and *Alte und Neue Quellen*, 1879) and Schaff (*The Creeds of Christendom*, 1877). On the Apostles' Creed, reference may be made to Dr. Swete's volume, *The Apostles' Creed: its Relation to Primitive Christianity* (1894), in which Harnack's pamphlet, *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss* (1892) (translated into English in the *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1893), is well answered. Other recent studies of the same creed from different points of view are the following: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufsymbols*, D. F. Kattenbusch (1892); *Das apostolische Symbolum*, T. Zahn (1893); *Das apostolische Taufsymbol*, Kattenbusch (vol. i. 1894); *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, C. Blume, S.J. (1893); *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*, C. Baeumer, O.S.B. (1893).

[2] Socrates, *H. E.* I. viii.

things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again in glory to judge the quick and dead.

"We believe also in One Holy Ghost."[1]

This creed, Eusebius tells us, was received without opposition. So far as it went, it was perfectly orthodox, and no objection could be taken to it. Only it did not express with quite sufficient clearness the great doctrine of our Lord's eternal divinity, which it was found necessary to guard against Arianism. It was therefore proposed that the crucial term, *Homoousios*, should be inserted in it. This was agreed to; and, finally, the following creed, which was evidently based on that proposed by Eusebius, was adopted and promulgated by the Council.

"*We believe in the One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible;*

"*And in one Lord, Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, Only-Begotten of the Father—that is, of the Substance of the Father—*God of God, Light of Light*, Very God of Very God; Begotten, not made, Being of one substance

[1] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον. It is curious that this creed ends so abruptly, and the probability is that Eusebius only quoted so much of the baptismal creed as was necessary for his purpose. Other early creeds always have the third division more fully developed, *e.g.*, the creed of Arius himself (Hahn, p. 190); of Antioch (*ibid.* pp. 64, 65); of the Apostolic Constitutions (p. 67); and that of the Council of Antioch of 341 (p. 103). It is impossible that the Baptismal Creed of Cæsarea can really have ended with the words, "We believe also in one Holy Ghost."

with the Father; *by whom all things were made*, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; *who* for us men, and *for our salvation*, came down, and *was incarnate*, and was made man; *suffered, and rose again the third day; ascended* into heaven; is coming *to judge the quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost.*"[1]

The clauses in italics are those which are also found in the creed of Eusebius, so that the amount of agreement between the two can easily be perceived. It will be seen that the fathers at Nicæa did a good deal more than merely insert the one important term *Homoousios.* As a matter of fact they framed *a new creed* on the basis of the creed of Cæsaræa—new in phraseology, but, as was shown above, in connection with the Second Article, not new in doctrine.

This creed, however, which was thus framed at Nicæa, is by no means verbally identical with that in use among us, which bears the name of the Nicene Creed. When or by whom, the additional clauses were inserted, and the alterations made whereby the creed assumed its present form, it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide with certainty. But it must have been *about the middle of the fourth century.* The grounds on which this conclusion rests are two. (1) The enlarged creed

[1] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, μονογενῆ—τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ· φῶς ἐκ φωτός· Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς· ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. To these were appended these anathemas: Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία·—Socrates, *H. E.* I. viii.

familiar to us (without the *Filioque*) is first met with in a work of Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, which was written in the year 373 or 374. It is there given in the following form:—

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker *of heaven and earth, and*[1] of all things visible and invisible.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, *Begotten of His Father before all worlds*—that is of the Substance of the Father—Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made, both that are in heaven and that are in earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down *from heaven*, and was incarnate *of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*, and was made man; *and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate*, and suffered, *and was buried*, and rose again the third day, *according to the Scriptures*, and ascended into heaven, *and sitteth at the right hand of the Father*, and is coming *again with glory* to judge the quick and dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end.* And in the Holy Ghost, *the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets: in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.*"[2]

[1] The clauses in italics are the new ones not found in the true creed of Nicæa.

[2] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, φῶς ἐκ φωτός· Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους

"This faith," Epiphanius adds, "was delivered by the holy apostles, and in the Church in the holy city, by all the holy bishops, above three hundred and ten in number." These last words indicate that the Nicene Council is intended, the traditional number of bishops present there being three hundred and eighteen. But it may be doubted whether Epiphanius meant to make the Council responsible for the *exact* words, any more than the apostles. He cannot possibly have imagined that this particular form of words was really drawn up by the apostles; and probably he is not to be understood as meaning that the creed was word for word that which came from Nicæa. It was the Nicene Creed, only in a revised and enlarged form. That the Church of the fourth century did not consider itself bound to the very words of the Creed put forth at Nicæa, except in so far as the crucial terms on the nature of the pre-incarnate Son were concerned, is shown by the fact that other versions of the Creed exist claiming, like that of Epiphanius, to be "Nicene."[1]

Moreover, Epiphanius himself, in the very next para-

καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου· καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς· καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρός· καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησιάν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. ἀμήν. Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, § 118. Epiphanius appends to this the anathemas of the Nicene Creed.

[1] The Syriac Creed of Mesopotamia now used by the Nestorian Churches, and the Cappadocian Creed now used by the Armenian Churches, both claim to be "Nicene," though differing widely from the original creed. See Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 110, and cf. p. 149 *seq.*, where these two creeds are given in full.

graph of the *Ancoratus*,[1] gives another enlarged form of the same creed, expanded in order to meet more fully the heresies of the Apollinarians and Macedonians, which he tells us had sprung up from the time of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens. This enables us to fix the date of the additional clauses in our own creed with some degree of certainty. The version is evidently given by Epiphanius, as that which was current before the date of Valentinian and Valens, who succeeded to the Empire in 364.

(2) Another consideration also points to the middle of the fourth century as the date of the additions. The expansion of the article on the Holy Ghost by the addition of the words, "the Lord and the life-giver; who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets," indicates that the Macedonian heresy had already begun to attract attention; while the addition of the clause "whose kingdom shall have no end," must have been due to the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra, who, in opposing Arianism, had become practically involved in a form of Sabellianism, and had been led to the denial of the eternity of Christ's kingdom. Now S. Cyril of Jerusalem read the last mentioned clause in the creed, which he expounded in his *Catechetical Lectures* in the year 347 or 348, and insisted on its importance, because of the heresy "lately sprung up in Galatia," for "a certain one has dared to affirm that after the end of the world Christ shall reign no longer; and he has dared to say that the Word which came forth from the Father shall be again absorbed into the Father, and shall be no more."[2] Thus

[1] *Ancoratus*, § 119.

[2] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* xv. § 27; cf. iv. 15: "Be sure to settle your belief in this point also, since there are many who say that Christ's kingdom has an end."

the existence of these clauses against Marcellus and the Macedonians points to a date not much *earlier* than 350, while the lack of additions, expressly directed against Apollinarianism, makes it tolerably certain that the form dates from a period prior to that in which Apollinaris had formulated the heresy associated with his name.[1] It cannot, therefore, be much *later* than the middle of the century.

Thus all the evidence points to 350, or thereabouts, as the date of the enlarged Creed, which we now term Nicene.

The *place* at which the development of the Creed first took place must be a matter of conjecture. No positive evidence is forthcoming. But from the great similarity which the enlarged creed bears to the Creed of S. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, it has been conjectured with much probability that the expansion must be traced to the Church of Jerusalem.

S. Cyril's Creed, as collected from his lectures, runs as follows:—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker *of heaven and earth*, and of all things visible and invisible.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, *who was begotten of the Father*, Very God, *before all worlds;* by whom all things were made; who

[1] This is very clearly seen by a comparison with the second of the Epiphanian Creeds, where the clauses on the Incarnation are expanded so as to insist on the *perfect* humanity of our Lord. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ. σαρκωθέντα, τουτέστι γεννηθέντα τελείως ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας τῆς ἀειπαρθένου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, τουτέστι τέλειον ἄνθρωπον λαβόντα, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα καὶ νοῦν καὶ πάντα, ἔι τι ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ. Both forms are given in Hahn, p. 70 *seq.*, and in Heurtley, *De Fide et Symbolo*, p. 11. It is possible that (as was asserted by Diogenes of Cyzicus, at Chalcedon) the words "He was incarnate *of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*," were added to guard against Apollinarianism (see, however, Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 90). But had the heresy been formidable, much more would seem to have been necessary, judging by the later form just cited.

was incarnate, and was made man; *was crucified, and buried*; rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, *and sitteth at the right hand of the Father*, and is coming in *glory* to judge the quick and dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end.*

"And in One Holy Ghost, the Comforter, *who spake in the prophets; and in one baptism* of repentance *for the remission of sins, and in one holy Catholic Church*, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life everlasting."[1]

If this be compared with the enlarged creed as given by Epiphanius, it will be seen that all the clauses which we have here put in italics, though wanting in the original Nicene Creed, are contained in the revised form of it. It would seem, then, highly probable that the said revised form is the result of a fusion of the original Nicene Creed with the local creed of the Church of Jerusalem, and (in accordance with what has been already said), that this fusion must have taken place about the middle of the fourth century.[2] This is perhaps

[1] Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννήθεντα Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς ἓν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Hahn, p. 62. Heurtley (*De Fide et Symbolo*, p. 9) reads, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα ἐκ παρθένου καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου. But where these words appear in *Cat.* iv. 9 and xii. 3, they probably form part of S. Cyril's comment and not of the actual creed; cf., however, Touttée's edition of *S. Cyril*, p. 84.

[2] See further the second of Hort's *Two Dissertations*, namely, that "on the Constantinopolitan Creed, and other Eastern creeds of the fourth century." Hort's view is that the creed is actually the local creed of Jerusalem, with an insertion from the Creed of Nicæa of the crucial passage on the nature of the pre-incarnate Son. "Light of Light, Very God of Very God, etc."

as far as we can go in tracing its origin. But, whatever may be thought of its connection with Jerusalem, the fact that it appears almost word for word as we have it, in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, in the year 373 or 374, is proof positive that the additions cannot have been "made" (as the common account states), at the Council of Constantinople in the year 381. This brings us to the question, Is the Council of Constantinople in any way responsible for the creed?

Grave doubts have been recently thrown on this responsibility by the following facts:—

1. None of the three early ecclesiastical historians, who relate the history of the Council—Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret — give any such creed as set forth by it.

2. Socrates and Sozomen both expressly state that the Fathers decided that the faith of the Council of Nicæa should remain inviolate.[1]

3. The first canon passed by the Council lays down in distinct terms that "the creed of the three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled at Nicæa shall not be made void, but remain firm"; and the synodical letter of the Fathers speaks in similar terms.[2]

4. At the Council of Ephesus in 431 no notice whatever was taken of the enlarged creed, but the genuine Creed of Nicæa was once more ratified and continued.[3]

On the other hand, there is to be set against this the fact that at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the enlarged creed was quoted as emanating from the Council of Constantinople, by those who themselves came from that city or its neighbourhood, and would therefore

[1] See Socrates, *H. E.* V. viii.; Sozomen, *H. E.* VII. ix.

[2] See Theodoret, *H. E.* V. ix.

[3] See the seventh canon of this Council, quoted above, p. 225.

be likely to have correct information on such a matter,[1] and it was finally accepted and ratified by the assembled Fathers in addition to the Creed of Nicæa. "We, therefore," so runs the definition of faith, "declare that the exposition of the right and blameless faith by the three hundred and eighteen holy and blessed Fathers, who were assembled at Nicæa in the time of the then Emperor Constantine of pious memory, should have the first place; and that those things should also be maintained which were defined by the hundred and fifty holy Fathers of Constantinople, for the taking away of the heresies which had then sprung up, and the confirmation of the same, our Catholic and Apostolic Faith." This definition was followed by the recital of *both* creeds—(1) the original Nicene, and (2) the enlarged Constantinopolitan form of it.

On a review of the whole evidence on both sides, it would seem quite clear that even if the Council of Constantinople made itself in any way responsible for the creed generally associated with it, it never intended it to *supersede* the creed put forth at Nicæa, or to come into general circulation as *the* creed of the Church universal. The silence of all the early authorities is conclusive on this point. But its recognition at Chalcedon may very possibly imply that it really received some sort of sanction at Constantinople *as an orthodox creed*.[2] But that is all that can be claimed for it. Before Chalcedon there is no trace of its general use; and even after this Council it only gradually made its way into general circulation. It probably superseded the true Nicene Creed, owing to its use in the euchar-

[1] See Lumby, *The History of the Creeds*, pp. 78–81.

[2] Hort argues that it may have been recognised at Constantinople as the Creed of Cyril of Jerusalem, whose authority was apparently impugned at the Council. See *Two Dissertations*, etc., pp. 97–107.

istic service, which dates in the East from about the middle of the sixth century;[1] in the West from some time later.[2] The confusion of name, and the transfer to the enlarged creed of the title Nicene, would appear to belong to a still later period.[3]

Appended are two forms of the creed—(1) the Greek text as commonly received in the East since Chalcedon, and (2) the Latin version which has been current in the Western Church since the Council of Toledo, 589.

"*Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κάτα τὰς γραφὰς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐράνους, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιὸν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφήτων· εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς· ἄφεσιν*

[1] *I.e.*, from the time of the Emperor Justin, see Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, vol. II. civ. Previously to this the true Nicene Creed had been used in some parts of the East.

[2] Spain adopting it first in 589.

[3] The enlarged creed was carefully distinguished from the Nicene at Toledo (see above, p. 216), but is confused with it and definitely termed Nicene in Charlemagne's *Capitulare* of 787 (quoted above, p. 221).

ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. ἀμήν."

"Credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Factorem cœli et terræ, atque visibilium omnium et invisibilium: Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex patre natum ante omnia sæcula, Deum de Deo, Lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri: Per quem omnia facta sunt, Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cœlis, et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est, crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato: passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas, et ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos: cujus regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per prophetas. Et unam sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum, et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen."

In comparing the English translation with this, three points deserve attention.

1. "By whom all things were made." As Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, the expression in the English "fails to suggest any idea different from the other expression in the creed, 'Maker of heaven and earth,' which has before been applied to the Father."[1] In the original, however, a distinction is accurately marked, and the preposition used (διὰ, not ὑπό, Latin *per*) describes the Son as the *mediate* agent of creation, *through* whom all things were made. The creed thus faithfully repro-

[1] Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, p. 122.

duces the teaching of Scripture, in which this preposition διὰ is specially used of the divine Word. *E.g.* S. John i. 3: "All things were made by (διά) Him"; ver. 10, "the world was made by Him" (δι' αὐτοῦ).[1]

2. "The Lord and Giver of life." Again to the English reader the phrase is ambiguous, and might be taken to mean the Lord of life and the Giver of the life; whereas in the original it is quite clear, "The Lord (τὸ κύριον used absolutely, expressing the Divinity of the Spirit), and the Life-giver (τὸ ζωοποιόν).

3. "One Catholic and Apostolic Church." In this clause there is no English equivalent to the word ἁγίαν, or *sanctam*. It is generally thought that the omission of the word "holy" in the translation first made for the English Prayer-Book of 1549 was simply due to a printer's error. But if so, it is strange that the blunder was never corrected in any of the subsequent editions of the Prayer-Book. And it has been plausibly argued that the omission was *deliberate*, not because the Reformers made light of holiness as a note of the Church, for the word "holy" is retained in the corresponding article in the Apostles' Creed, "the holy Catholic Church" — but because they imagined on critical grounds that it had no place in the true text of the creed. It is certainly the case that the word was wanting in the creed as given in some of the early editions of the Councils which were accessible to them, and they may have thought that they were restoring a truer text than that which had been previously in use.[2] However this may be, whether the omission was intentional or due to inadvertence, there is no doubt that it is wrong, and that we ought to read this article with the

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2.

[2] See an article on "The Anglican Version of the Nicene Creed," *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. viii. p. 372.

four notes of the Church plainly expressed: "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church."

IV. *The Athanasian Creed.*

As the Apostles' Creed was not composed by the apostles, and the Nicene Creed is not the Creed of Nicæa, so the Athanasian Creed is not the work of Athanasius. Not only is the creed indebted (as will presently be shown) for much of its language to the works of Augustine written some years after the death of Athanasius, but also there can be no question that the original language of the creed is Latin, whereas Athanasius wrote in Greek. "It is certain," says Dr. Lumby, "that whoever peruses the various Greek versions of the creed which are extant cannot fail to abandon the notion that the original language of this composition was Greek. The unusual words and strange constructions betray the hand of translators, and those not of great skill. That this may be apparent from different versions, the first two verses are subjoined. . . . They vary widely from one another, as will be seen, and bear no trace whatever of a common Greek original. It is, therefore, impossible to believe that any such original ever existed." [1]

"Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem; quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit."

"(1) *Εἴ τις θέλει σωθῆναι, πρὸ πάντων χρὴ αὐτῷ τὴν καθολικὴν κρατῆσαι πίστιν· ἣν εἰ μή τις ὑγιῆ καὶ ἄμωμον τηρήσειε, πάσης ἀμφιβολίας ἐκτός εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολεῖται.*

"(2) *Τῷ θέλοντι σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων ἀνάγκη τὴι*

[1] *The History of the Creeds*, p. 189.

καθολικὴν πίστιν κατέχειν· ἣν εἰ μή τις ἀκεραίαν καὶ ἀπαράθραυστον συντηρήσειεν ἀναμφιβόλως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολεῖται.

"(3) *Ὅστις ἂν βούληται σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων χρὴ κρατεῖν τὴν καθολικὴν πίστιν· ἣν εἰ μὴ εἷς ἕκαστος σώαν καὶ ἀμώμητον τηρήσῃ ἄνευ δισταγμοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολεῖται.*

"(4) *Ἔι τις βούλοιτο σωθῆναι πρὸ πάντων αὐτῷ χρεία κρατῆσαι τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν· ἣν ἐὰν μή τις ἀμόλυντον καὶ ἄφθορον τηρήσῃ αἰώνιον εὑρήσει τὴν ἀπώλειαν.*"

This specimen is quite sufficient to demonstrate that the creed originated in the West and not at Alexandria. How, then, did it get its name? It has been thought that this may be accounted for by the fact that it contains an exposition of the doctrine which Athanasius so nobly defended, and of which he was the most prominent champion against Arianism; and accordingly the suggestion has been made[1] that when Arianism was rife in the West, the Arians may have termed the orthodox party Athanasians, and the creed which most fully expressed their doctrines "the Athanasian Creed." This does not seem a very probable explanation of the origin of the names, and it is more reasonable to suppose that the name was attached to the creed because it was erroneously believed to be the work of Athanasius. In an uncritical age traditions concerning the authorship of famous documents easily grew up, often without the slightest foundation—witness the ascription of the Te Deum to S. Ambrose and S. Augustine—and even if we cannot now explain exactly how the title *Fides Athanasii* first became attached to the creed, whether by the carelessness of a copyist, or as a guess at authorship, there is no need to seek for any further explana-

[1] By Bishop Browne, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 224; after Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. viii.

tion of its perpetuation than the belief that it was the work of the saint whose name was given to it.

Concerning the date of the creed, no small controversy has arisen. Its ascription to Athanasius can be traced back to the ninth century, nor does it appear that it was ever seriously questioned until the seventeenth century.[1] Almost the first to reject the traditional title of it was Gerard Voss, in his work *De Tribus Symbolis*, published in 1642. From his date onward the Athanasian authorship was generally given up, and various names were suggested by writers on the subject,[2] until in 1723 the *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed* was published by Daniel Waterland. This masterly work was commonly regarded as conclusive, and the controversy was set at rest for the next hundred and fifty years, and has only been reopened in recent times, largely owing to the discovery of evidence unknown to Waterland. His conclusion, based on a careful examination of both external and internal evi-

[1] It will be noticed that in the Eighth Article, Cranmer (or whoever drew it up) indicated his rejection of the tradition concerning the apostolic authorship of the Apostles' Creed, by speaking of it as "that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed," but spoke unhesitatingly of this other as "Athanasius' Creed." In the Ten Articles of 1536 it is said of the three creeds that "one was made by the apostles, and is the common creed, which every man useth; the second was made by the Holy Council of Nice, and is said daily in the mass; and the third was made by Athanasius, and is comprehended in the Psalm *Quicunque Vult*" (Article III). The rubric in the Prayer-Book which entitles it "this confession of our Christian faith, *commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius*," dates from 1662. In the earlier editions of the Prayer-Books there was nothing corresponding to the words in italics.

[2] (1) Voss himself thought that the creed was the work of a Gallican writer, possibly as late as the eighth or ninth century; (2) Paschasius Quesnel (1675) assigned it to Vigilius Tapsensis in the fifth century. So Cave, Dupin, Pagi and others; (3) Antelmi (1693) suggested Vincent of Lerins, also belonging to the fifth century; (4) Muratori (1698) gives it to Venantius Fortunatus in the sixth; while (5) Waterland himself decides in favour of Hilary of Arles.

dence, was that the creed was composed in Gaul between the years 420 and 430, and that it is very probably the work of Hilary of Arles. That it cannot be earlier than 420 may be taken as certain, for the coincidences of thought and expression between it and the writings of S. Augustine are so striking as to lead to the conclusion that the author of the creed, whoever he may have been, must have been well acquainted with the works of S. Augustine, including his books on the "Trinity," which were not published until 416.[1]

Waterland's *terminus ad quem* is arrived at mainly from internal evidence. The date fixed by him as the latest possible one for the composition of the creed is 430 A.D. This year is selected because he maintains that the creed does not condemn the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies in the full, direct, and critical terms, such as would naturally have been used had it been composed after these heresies had arisen and become formidable. There is nothing, so he asserts, in the creed but what is found in earlier writers in combating the errors of Arius and Apollinaris. Even those clauses (vers. 32–35) which at first sight bear the appearance of being expressly intended to condemn the Nestorian division of Christ into "two Persons," are found on examination to be based entirely on the writings of Augustine, so that there is really scarcely a phrase contained in them which may not be paralleled in one or other of Augustine's works.[2]

[1] Compare Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. ix., where the creed is given with parallel passages from the Fathers, and more especially from S. Augustine.

[2] See Waterland, ch. ix. The following striking parallels may be quoted: "Agnoscamus geminam substantiam Christi; divinam scilicet qua æqualis est Patri, humanam qua major est Pater: utrumque autem simul non duo sed unus est Christus."—*In Johan. Evan. Tr.* lxxviii. 3. "Verbum caro factum est, a Divinitate carne suscepta, non in carnem

The *external evidence* as given by Waterland, although not necessitating quite so early a date as 430, is not inconsistent with it. If the creed is a composition of the fifth century, there is nothing surprising in the fact that no external testimonies to its use have come down to us before the sixth and seventh centuries to which Waterland assigns his earliest authorities. Recent researches, however, have shown that it is not safe to appeal without hesitation to some of Waterland's most important witnesses to the early use of the creed. Consequently the whole subject has been reopened, and the question of the date of the creed has been reconsidered in the light of modern discoveries.

The three most ancient testimonies relied on by Waterland are the following:—

1. A canon of a Council of Autun, insisting on the recitation of "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" by the clergy. Of this he gives the date as 670 A.D.[1]

2. A MS. "mentioned by Bishop Usher, which he had seen in the Cotton Library, and which he judged to come up to the age of Gregory the Great," *i.e. circa* 600. This MS., Waterland says, was not to be found when he wrote, but he entertains no doubt that Usher had really seen it, and is inclined to trust his judgment on the question of its date.

3. A commentary on the creed, published by Muratori, and unhesitatingly assigned by Waterland

Divinitate mutata."—*Enchiridion*, ch. xxxiv. "Idem Deus qui homo et qui Deus idem homo: non confusione naturæ, sed unitate personæ." —Serm. clxxxvi. "Sicut enim unus est homo anima rationalis et caro; sic unus est Christus Deus et homo."—*In Johan. Evan. Tr.* lxxviii. 3.

[1] "Si quis presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus vel clericus symbolum quod sancto inspirante spiritu Apostoli tradiderunt, et fidem Sancti Athanasii præsulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit, ab episcopo condemnatur." *Hardouin*, vol. iii. p. 13.

(as by its first editor) to Venantius Fortunatus, Bishop of Poictiers about 570.

Now with regard to these three pieces of evidence, it must be noted *first*, that though the canon referred to is a real canon of Autun, reasons have been given for doubting whether it actually belongs to the series passed in the Synod of 670;[1] and its date cannot be appealed to with the same confidence as formerly. *Secondly*, Archbishop Usher's lost "Cotton MS." has been discovered since Waterland's day in the library at Utrecht. It is now well known to scholars as the "Utrecht Psalter," and the opinion of experts assigns it to a date considerably later than that at which Usher put it. Indeed, there are grounds for thinking that it may have been written as late as the ninth century.[2] *Thirdly*, the commentary, supposed by Waterland to be the work of Venantius Fortunatus, is only assigned to "Fortunatus" in a single MS.[3] But Fortunatus is not an uncommon name, and there is really nothing whatever to identify the author of the commentary with *Venantius* Fortunatus, the Bishop of Poictiers in the sixth century. Thus the reason given for dating this work about the year 570 disappears altogether.

In this way the earliest testimonies formerly brought forward have had doubts thrown upon their value, and it has been thought that the internal evidence, if unsupported by early external authorities, is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider the creed as a work of the fifth century. Further, it has been said that there is no

[1] See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 204.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 210.

[3] The MS. which is at Milan (M. 79 *sup.*) is assigned to the eleventh century. In other MSS. of the same commentary or exposition, *e.g.* that in the Bodleian (Junius, 25) no author's name is attached to it. See Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, ch. xxix. and Lumby, p. 208.

certain reference to it as the *Fides Athanasii* till the ninth century,[1] though many striking parallels with different portions of it can be quoted from writings of an earlier date. Consequently, some writers have maintained that, even if the materials out of which it is compiled are comparatively early, yet in its completed form it must be set down as a work of the ninth century.[2]

This view the present writer finds it quite impossible to accept. It appears to him that although Waterland's chapters on the external testimonies, commentaries, and MSS. of the creed may require rewriting, yet a considerable portion of the early evidence adduced by him remains unshaken, and fresh evidence unknown in his day has been discovered, so that we are compelled to assign to the creed a date if not actually during the fifth century, yet at the latest before the close of the sixth.

1. Manuscripts of the creed, which were undoubtedly written during the ninth and tenth centuries, are comparatively numerous, some of them being assigned by competent authorities to the *early years* of the ninth. But besides these there are at least *three* MSS. of it, which in the opinion of the highest authorities on palæo-

[1] Waterland gives three MSS. earlier than the ninth century as assigning it to Athanasius, namely, *King Athelstan's Psalter*, in the British Museum (Galba, A. xviii.), which he dates in 703. A S. Germains' MS. (257) at Paris, collated by Montfaucon, assigned to 760, and the Psalter given by Charles to Hadrian, now at Vienna (1861), which, if Charles be Charlemagne, and Hadrian the first of that name, must belong to the year 772. But the dates of all these MSS. have been questioned (see below).

[2] The late Dr. Swainson strongly contended that it belonged to the ninth century; and with him Dr. Lumby to some extent agrees, as he holds that *in its present form* the creed was only compiled between A.D. 813 and 850; though he maintains that "before that date two separate compositions existed [one on the Trinity and the other on the Incarnation] which form the groundwork of the present *Quicunque*."—*History of the Creeds*, p. 254.

graphy were written *before the close of the eighth century*, viz. :—

(*a*) Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, 4858 (formerly 4908).—A copy of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, to which is appended at the close of the MS. a copy of the Athanasian Creed. In this it is without title, and only the first eleven verses are found, as the volume is mutilated and the remainder is torn off. This MS. is assigned by the present authorities of the MS. department at Paris, as it was by Montfaucon, to the later part of the eighth century.[1]

(*b*) Paris, 13159.—A Psalter with Canticles followed by the Athanasian Creed, with no title. Internal evidence seems to fix the date of this MS. beyond question to the period between 795 and 800, as, in the litany contained in it, there are prayers for Leo who became pope in 795, and for Charles as "Rex," which shows that it was written before he was crowned Emperor in 800. This date is accepted by M. Delisle and other authorities. It may be added that this MS. was unknown to Waterland.[2]

(*c*) Milan, Ambr. O. 212.—A MS. containing various documents, including among others the Athanasian Creed without title. This MS. was assigned by Muratori to the seventh century, by Montfaucon to the eighth, and with him agrees the present librarian at Milan, Dr. Ceriani.[3]

Besides these three MSS., two of which contain the creed

[1] Dr. Lumby mentions this MS., but does not really attempt to prove that it is later than the date assigned to it. See *History of the Creeds*, p. 225.

[2] Swainson describes this MS., and was evidently perplexed by it, but honestly tells us that M. Delisle assigns it to the year 795.—*Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 350. Dr. Lumby fails to notice it at all.

[3] Swainson and Dr. Lumby both try to make out that it is later, but their opinion on such a matter can hardly be set against the judgment of such experts as those mentioned in the text.

complete, the other being mutilated, there is (*d*) what is known as the "Trèves fragment." This is only known to us from a Paris MS. (3836) generally dated about 730. It contains a fragment of an address by a preacher to his congregation comprising much of the latter part of the Athanasian Creed, which address the writer says that he found in a book at Trèves. The original Trèves manuscript has not been discovered, but its date must be placed considerably earlier than that of the Paris MS. in which it was copied, and some have thought that it must have been written not later than the fifth century.[1] It has been suggested that it gives the groundwork from which the latter part of the *Quicunque* was subsequently worked up,[2] but it would seem to be a truer view that the preacher whose sermon is given in the MS. was actually quoting the creed, and applying it. If this is so, the document may be appealed to as bearing witness to the previous existence of the creed, the language of which it adopts and modifies.[3]

Mention must also be made of two other MSS. of the creed.

(*e*) Vienna, 1861.—This is the psalter presented by "Charles" to Pope Hadrian, which Waterland, identifying Charles with Charlemagne, and Hadrian with the first pope of that name, assigned to 772. It has, however, been pointed out that Charles may be identified with Charles the Bald, and the pope with Hadrian II., in which case the MS. will belong not to the eighth but to the latter part of the ninth century. It contains the creed, under the title "Fides Sci Athanasii Epi Alexandrini."[4]

[1] See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, p. 216.

[2] So Swainson and Lumby.

[3] See Ommanney, *The Early History of the Athanasian Creed*, pp. 126, 213, and 408, where a copy of the fragment is given.

[4] See Swainson, p. 372, and Lumby, p. 221.

(*f*) St. Germains, 257, as described by Montfaucon, is placed by Waterland after him as of the date 760, and the title of the creed in it is given as "Fides Sancti Athanasii Episcopi Alexandriæ."—Unhappily the MS. is now lost, and therefore the date cannot be appealed to with absolute confidence, though the opinion of Montfaucon on such a subject is not lightly to be set aside. Without, however, laying stress on the last two manuscripts enumerated (*e*) and (*f*), there remain, in addition to the Treves fragment, *three* in regard to which there is absolutely no reason for refusing to credit the judgment of experts on the question of their date.[1] And if the dates assigned to them be accepted we may dismiss without further consideration the notion that the creed itself can have been a compilation of the ninth century.

2. A second important branch of evidence to the antiquity of the creed is to be found in *early collections of canons* in which it finds a place.

(*a*) Paris, 3848 B.—A MS. of the early part of the ninth century contains not only a collection of canons, which includes the Autun Canon, ordering "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" to be learnt by heart by all the clergy, but also a series of testimonies to the faith preceding the canons. Among these the Athanasian Creed itself is given in full under the title of "Fides Sanct. Athanasii Episcopi."[2]

(*b*) Paris, 1451, is another MS. assigned by the best authorities to the same date, being probably written before the death of Leo III. in 816. It also contains a collection of canons, and also the full text of the Atha-

[1] *King Athelstan's Psalter* in the British Museum (Galba A, xviii.), which Waterland put at the date 703, is now universally assigned to the ninth century.

[2] Maassen, *Biblioth. Latina Juris Canonici*; cf. Swainson, p. 268. Ommanney, *Early History of the Athanasian Creed*, p. 92.

nasian Creed, "Incipit exemplar fidei $\overline{\text{cht}}$ $\overline{\text{Sci}}$ Athanasii Epi Alexandrine ecclesie."[1]

(*c*) Vatican, Palat. 540.—A MS. also belonging to the ninth century; contains a Gallican collection of canons assigned to the sixth century, immediately followed by some other documents, including the creed: "Incipit fides Catholica beati Athanasii Episcopi."[2]

(*d*) Further, the Canon of Autun, mentioned above, even if it cannot be unhesitatingly connected with the Synod held under S. Leger in the year 670 *cannot be later than the eighth century.* Dr. Swainson himself admits that it is found in "five manuscripts of the ninth century, and one of the eighth or ninth";[3] and in the face of the evidence borne by the Paris MS. (3848 B) mentioned above, it is absurd to suppose that "the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius" can mean anything but the *Quicunque vult.*

3. Thirdly, we have the evidence of the early commentaries upon the creed. Our knowledge of these has been considerably increased of late years by the researches of Mr. Ommanney, and we are now able to state that there are several other comparatively early ones as well as (*a*) that which Waterland ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus. As we have already seen, there is no doubt that he was wrong in thus ascribing it to him. But though the authorship of the commentary is unknown, internal evidence is strongly in favour of its belonging to an early date. Besides this, Mr. Ommanney describes four other important commentaries—(*b*) the "Paris" Commentary which he holds to have been drawn up "not

[1] Maassen, *Biblioth. Latina Juris Canonici*; cf. Swainson, p. 268. Ommanney, *The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of S. Athanasius*, p. 28.

[2] *De Antiquis Collectionibus Canonum* (Ed. Ballerini) ii. ch. x. §§ 2, 3. Cf. Maassen and Swainson, *ubi supra.*

[3] *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 272.

later than the ninth century, and not earlier than the seventh"; (*c*) the "Bouhier," of the eighth, (*d*) the "Oratorian" of the beginning of the eighth or quite the end of the seventh; and (*e*) the "Troyes" between 649 and 680.[1] It must be borne in mind that the dates of these commentaries are not certain. But, even if they are not earlier than the ninth century, they would still imply that the creed was then regarded as a work of considerable antiquity. Commentaries are not written on new and recent works, but on those of long-standing and repute in the Church. It is remarkable also that in two of these Commentaries, the "Oratorian" and the "Bouhier" it is said that the creed was attributed to Athanasius, *etiam in veteribus codicibus.* Now the actual MSS. of these commentaries may not be older than the tenth century: but if even then there were in existence MSS. of the creed which could be termed "old," and which contained the title referring it to the authorship of Athanasius, a further argument is supplied in support of its early date.[2]

4. We are now in a position to estimate the bearing of *coincidences of language* with early writers. The three branches of evidence, of which the most important items have just been enumerated, are sufficient to show that by the ninth century at the latest the creed had obtained a recognised position. It was even then beginning to be admitted into ecclesiastical Psalters, together with the Te Deum, and the Canticles of the New Testament. It was ordered to be learnt by heart by the clergy, and commentaries were written upon it. Consequently, when we find that the language of the creed appears also in sermons and professions of faith, it is only reasonable to hold that

[1] On all the commentaries reference may be made to Ommanney's *Early History of the Athanasian Creed.*

[2] Compare Ommanney, p. 37.

such coincidences imply a knowledge of the creed on the part of the writers in question. Nor can it fairly be inferred that if a writer only quotes a portion of the creed, the remainder did not exist in the document from which his citation was drawn. It cannot be said that there is any definite external evidence of the existence of two separate compositions which formed the groundwork of our present *Quicunque vult*; and, therefore, we are justified, as in the case of any other work, in appealing to a citation as at least *prima facie* evidence of a knowledge of the document as it is found in every single MS. that contains it.

Of writers who appear thus to make use of the creed, the following may be mentioned:—

(*a*) Denebert, Bishop of Worcester, after his election to the bishopric in 798, made a profession of faith, which has been preserved to us, and affords clear evidence that the Athanasian Creed had already found its way into England, for in this profession he quotes a large part of it, saying that he will expound the orthodox Catholic and Apostolic faith, as he has learnt it, "for it is written, Whosoever will be saved, etc." Since he introduces his citation with the formula, "it is written," it is manifest that he is quoting from a recognised and familiar document, and as he proceeds to express his adherence to the decrees of the six General Councils, there was no necessity for him to quote more of the creed than the portion referring to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as the Church's faith in the Incarnation is fully set forth in the decrees of the Councils.[1]

(*b*) The "Trèves fragment" referred to above must be

[1] See Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, vol. iii. p. 526. "Insuper et orthodoxam catholicam apostolicamque fidem sicut didici paucis exponam verbis, quia scriptum est quicunque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est illi ut teneat catholicam fidem. Fides autem Catholica hæc est ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate

mentioned again in this place, since it supplies a clear instance of a writer making use of the creed. It is, as has already been said, a portion of a sermon on the creed, the language of which is freely referred to, and applied, as it might be, by any modern preacher. This takes us back to a considerably earlier date than Denebert's profession, possibly even to the fifth century.[1]

(*c*) Howsoever this may be, we are brought to the *sixth* century by another consideration. In the appendix to the sermons of Augustine is a discourse formerly attributed to him which the Benedictine editors of his works ascribed to Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles from 502 to 542.[2] Their conclusion is accepted by recent writers,[3] and if it can be established, it will furnish a strong argument for Waterland's view that the creed emanated from Southern Gaul during the fifth century, for the sermon in question obviously betrays a knowledge of the *Quicunque vult*, alluding to *both* parts of it, namely, that on the Incarnation as well as that on the Holy Trinity.[4]

veneremur ; neque confundentes personas neque substantiam separantes ; alia est enim Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti ; sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est Divinitas, æqualis gloria, coæterna majestas ; Pater a nullo factus est, nec creatus nec genitus ; Filius a Patre solo est ; non factus, nec creatus, sed genitus ; Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens. In hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres Personæ coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales ; ita ut per omnia sicut supra dictum est, et Trinitas in Unitate et Unitas in Trinitate veneranda sit. Suscipio etiam decreta Pontificum, et sex synodos Catholicas antiquorum heroicorum virorum et præfixam ab eis regulam sincera devotione conservo. Hæc est fides nostra," etc.

[1] See above, p. 337.

[2] *Opera*, vol. v. Appendix, Serm. ccxliv.

[3] *E.g.* Caspari, Kattenbusch, G. F. Arnold, and Malnory. In any case, as the Baptismal Creed commented upon corresponds closely with what we know to have been the form of the Gallican Creed about the fifth century, the sermon cannot be much later than Cæsarius.

[4] The discourse begins as follows:—"Rogo et admoneo vos, fratres carissimi, ut quicunque vult salvus esse, fidem rectam ac Catholicam discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conservet. Ita ergo oportet uni-

(*d*) A discourse of a somewhat similar character, but, to judge from some features in the character of the Baptismal Creed commented upon in it, possibly belonging to a yet earlier date, has been discovered and printed by Mr. Ommanney.[1] It likewise seems to allude to the *Quicunque vult*, and to imply a familiarity with its contents on the part of the preacher.

On the whole, then, it is believed that the attacks made upon the antiquity of the creed have completely failed, and that there is no reason for discarding the older view, which regarded it as a work of the fifth century, composed by some writer belonging to the Gallican Church. In style it bears a strong resemblance to the writings of Vincent of Lerins (who died about 450), and if not actually his work, is probably from the hand of someone of the same school, who was familiar with his *Commonitorium*, and borrowed from it.[2]

cuique observare ut credat Patrem, credat Filium, et credat Spiritum Sanctum. Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus; sed tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credat unusquisque fidelis quod Filius æqualis est Patri secundum Divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit; Spiritus vero Sanctus ab utroque procedens. Credite, ergo, carissimi, in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem," etc.

[1] *Early History, etc.*, p. 121, and cf. p. 393, where the sermon is printed in full. It is contained in the Paris MS. mentioned above, 3848 B, assigned to the early part of the ninth century, and in another of the same date, 2123. The Baptismal Creed commented on in it is curious. An early date may be inferred from the omission of the words *passus*, *mortuus*, *descendit ad inferna*, *sanctorum communionem*, *vitam æternam*. But, on the other hand, it agrees with the remarkable form found in the *Bangor Antiphonary* (fol. 19), in reading "in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, invisibilem, visibilium et invisibilium omnium rerum conditorem," and "in Spiritum Sanctum Deum omnipotentem unam habentem substantiam cum Patre et Filio"; while, like one of the creeds in the "*Missale Gallicanum*, it has the phrase, "*Victor* ascendit ad cœlos." These features may, perhaps, point to a later date than that which Mr. Ommanney is disposed to assign to it.

[2] Compare these passages of the *Commonitorium*: "Ecclesia vero Catholica . . . et unam Divinitatem in Trinitatis plenitudine, et Trini-

From the question of the date of the creed, which, after all, is a matter of comparatively small importance, we may pass in conclusion to the consideration of *the use made of the creed by the Church of England.* It has been said in the Western Church in the office of Prime certainly since the tenth century.[1] According to Roman use it is said at this service only on Sundays, but according to the Sarum use, followed in England before the Reformation, it was ordered to be said daily. Prime, however, is a service of monastic origin, and was never intended for a general congregation. Consequently, when on the publication of the first English Prayer-Book in 1549, this confession of our faith was ordered to be recited at matins immediately after Benedictus on the six great festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday, a new departure was taken, and for the first time this creed was adopted for *popular* use. Owing to its position in the Prayer-Book, and its use in the public service of the Church on the six great festivals, and (since 1552) on seven saints' days,[2] the

tatis æqualitatem in una atque eadem majestate veneratur, et unum Christum Jesum, non duos, eundemque Deum pariter atque hominem confitetur. . . . . Alia est Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti. Altera substantia Divinitatis, altera humanitatis; sed tamen Deitas et humanitas non alter et alter, sed unus idemque Christus, unus idemque Filius Dei, et unius ejusdemque Christi et filii Dei una eademque Persona; sicut in homine aliud caro, et aliud anima; sed unus idemque homo, anima et caro . . . unus idemque Christus Deus et homo . . . idem Patri æqualis et minor; idem ex Patre ante secula genitus item in seculo ex matre generatus; perfectus Deus, perfectus homo; in Deo summa Divinitas in homine plena humanitas . . . Unus, autem, non corruptibili nescio qua Divinitatis et humanitatis confusione, sed integra et singulari quadam Unitate personæ."—*Commonitorium Vincentii Lerinensis*, ch. xiii.

[1] This is rendered certain from its position in the Psalters. It is alluded to by Honorius of Autun (1136) in the *Gemma Animæ*, bk. ii. ch. 60; by Abbo of Fleury, A.D. 1001 (Migne, cxxxix. p. 462), but not by Amalarius or Walafrid Strabo in the ninth century.

[2] Not until 1662 was the order given for it to be *substituted* for the Apostles' Creed on those days for which it is appointed.

Quicunque vult is probably much more familiar to the lay members of the Church of England than to those of any other community; and since there is abundant evidence that it is often misunderstood and regarded with suspicion, it may be well to say something in explanation of it, and in answer to the popular objections which are urged against it.

The creed itself falls into two clearly marked divisions. Part 1 (verses 1–26) states the doctrine of the Trinity; Part 2 (verses 27–40) the doctrine of the Incarnation. The form in which the Church's faith is stated in each case is due to the fact that heresies had arisen and had to be met. Thus in Part 1 the two chief heresies combated are those of Sabellius and Arius. The former of these "confounded the Persons," while the latter "divided the substance." The necessity of excluding these errors is obviously present to the mind of the writer from verses 5 to 26, and accounts for most of the expressions used, so that if the character of the heresies in question be borne in mind, the meaning of this portion of the creed will be readily understood.[1] The second part begins with

[1] In verse, 9 "incomprehensible" in the English translation is misleading. The Latin is *immensus, i.e. infinite.* Cf. *Patrem immensæ majestatis,* "the Father of an *infinite* majesty" in the Te Deum. It is a little uncertain whether the English "incomprehensible" was intended by the translators to be taken in the sense of "illimitable" or infinite; or whether the rendering was meant by them to be equivalent to "inconceivable," as the translation of the Greek ἀκατάληπτος, for that they imagined the Greek to be the original, and translated from it may be taken as certain. See Bp. Dowden's *Quæstiunculæ Liturgicæ.*

In verse 19, "by Himself," represents the Latin *singillatim,* and means "severally." Cf. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei,* XI. xxiv. "Cum de singulis quæritur unusquisque eorum et Deus et Omnipotens esse respondeatur; cum vero de omnibus simul, non tres dii vel tres omnipotentes sed unus Deus omnipotens."

Verse 24: "And in this Trinity none is afore or after other: none is greater or less than another." The words are neuter, *nihil prius aut posterius; nihil majus aut minus* ("Naught (or nothing) is afore or

verse 27, and in it the doctrine of the Incarnation is stated at some length. Here again the thought of Arianism is present; for it and Apollinarianism are the principal heresies kept in view. As has been already shown, it is uncertain whether Nestorianism and Eutychianism were directly before the writer of the creed, though the former of these is effectually excluded by the terms (borrowed from Augustine) which are used in verses 32 to 35 :—

"Who although He be God and Man: yet He is not two, but one Christ;
One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God;
One altogether; not by Confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.
For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and man is one Christ."[1]

There remain the so-called "damnatory clauses" to be considered, and to these exception is often taken. Men point to them and say that they are harsh and uncharitable. It is owing to their presence that they object to the use of the creed, and complain (1) that it expressly makes salvation depend upon the correctness of a man's faith, and that poor simple folk can scarcely be expected to understand and hold all that is here set before them, and (2) that these "damnatory clauses" exclude from all hope of salvation not merely the heathen, but Socinians,

after: naught (or nothing) is greater or less.") The first phrase refers to *duration*, the second to *dignity*. The next clause is explanatory of this: "But the whole three Persons are *co-eternal* together and *co-equal*."

[1] Whatever may be thought of the bearing of these verses on the date of the creed as far as *Nestorianism* is concerned (and they are certainly very similar to language used against it by Vincent of Lerins), it seems almost impossible that they can have been written *after* Eutychianism had arisen. Verses 33 and 35 would surely have been worded differently, had the error of thinking that the manhood was absorbed into the Godhead arisen.

Arians, and all others who do not believe in the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation as here expounded.

Now it will be found that these difficulties are, if not entirely removed, at any rate greatly mitigated by observing what the creed really says. The English translation is in several places by no means exact. There is a harsh ring about it, which is wanting in the Latin. Moreover, in common parlance, the sharp edges of meaning often get rubbed off words in familiar use, so that, even where the translation is really not inadequate, phrases are liable to be taken in an inexact sense instead of being given the precise meaning which is really demanded.

The opening clauses of the creed in the original run as follows :—

"Quicunque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem ;
Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit absque dubio in æternum peribit."

There are several terms here which call for a brief comment.

Quicunque vult salvus esse. It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact that in the English rendering "whosoever will be saved," "will" is not the auxiliary verb. But it would be well if the meaning of the phrase could be placed beyond the possibility of misconception by the substitution of "wishes" or "desires." "Whosoever," then "wishes to be *salvus*." Here, it must be admitted, there is an ambiguity in the Latin. It is possible that the word *salvus* should be taken as the equivalent to the Greek σωζόμενος in Acts ii. 47, *i.e.* "in a state of salvation (Vulgate, *qui salvi fierent*), or even that it should be rendered "in a sound and healthy condition" (spiritually). It is certainly used in the sense of "safe" or "in the way of salvation" by S. Vincent of

Lerins.[1] But on the other hand, it is employed in the Vulgate and in the writings of Augustine, in passages where it must mean more than this, and imply what is commonly understood by "saved."[2] Which was the precise sense intended by the author of the creed it may be hard to determine; nor does it seem really important to decide, when once it is fairly realised that the creed is only speaking of the *desire* for safety or salvation. But whatever be the precise shade of meaning given to this word *salvus* the significance of the verbs *teneat* and *servaverit* is perfectly clear. "Hold" and "keep" are not inadequate renderings; but if "keep" and "preserve" were substituted for them the drift of the clause would be more sharply brought out; and the English reader would feel at once that *the warning is against apostasy, i.e.* against letting go that which has actually been received. It is impossible for a man to "keep" or "preserve" that which is not previously in his possession. It would be an abuse of terms to tell an impure person to "preserve his chastity." He cannot do it, for such a phrase necessarily implies previous innocence and purity. So also when it is said of the Catholic faith that "except every one do keep [it] whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly," it is obvious that the only case contemplated is that of men who have already received it and are in possession of it.[3] This indicates that

[1] *Commonitorium* ch. iv.: "Intra sacraria Catholicæ fidei salvi esse potuerunt."

[2] The word is constantly used in the Vulgate, not only for σωζόμενος in Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15, but for other parts of the verb. See *e.g.* S. Matt. xix. 25, xxiv. 13; Acts ii. 21, xi. 14, xvi. 30; Rom. v. 9, etc. So in Augustine it often means a good deal more than σωζόμενος. See the use of it in *Enchiridion*, ch. xciv. xcvii.; *De Spiritu et Litera*, ch. lviii.; *Contra Julian. Pelag.* iv. c. xlii. *seq.*

[3] Archdeacon Norris takes *servare fidem* in the creed as equivalent to the same phrase in the Vulgate in 2 Tim. iv. 7, where it is used to translate S. Paul's expression τηρεῖν τὴν πίστιν, and he holds that both

the warnings of the creed do not touch the case of the heathen or of any who are brought up in hereditary error (*e.g.* Socinians and Arians), but they apply only to those within the Church. The Church is not called upon to judge "them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 12).[1] But she *is* "bound to declare the whole counsel of God"; and it cannot be denied that there is a very severe side to the teaching of Scripture, and that our Lord Himself and His apostles speak in strong terms of the loss incurred by those who reject the faith.[2] But though the Church is bound to state the revealed law and to assert the rule of judgment which follows on wilful rejection of the faith, yet it is not for her to assume the office of judge and apply the law to individual cases. Thus we have no right to say of any given individual, that A. B. "without doubt will perish everlastingly." This may require to be made somewhat clearer. To our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned," common sense supplies certain limitations, and those who accept our Lord's statement in the fullest loyalty, yet understand that the "damnation" spoken of will only be incurred by those who, having had His claims set before their conscience, wilfully reject Him, and disbelieve. But who shall say in any given case whether the rejection has been wilful? To us it may appear that it has been so. But there is so much invincible prejudice

this phrase and the words *integram inviolatamque* have a moral meaning, "undefiled by a bad life." "Which faith, except each one, keep in integrity and purity."—*Rudiments of Theology*, p. 257. It may be added that "before all things," *ante omnia*, does not mean more than that right faith must precede right practice.

[1] See further on Article XVIII., where more will be said on the case of the heathen.

[2] See especially [S. Mark] xvi. 16; S. John iii. 36; and cf. R. W. Church, *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 101 *seq.*

in the world, and the force of evidence strikes different minds so differently that it is impossible to say for certain whether the man has ever had the faith fairly set before his conscience. Not till the secrets of all hearts are revealed at the last day can it be known who they are who have "not believed," and who, therefore, "shall be damned." In precisely the same way as that in which we deal with a text such as this, should we deal with the statements of the Athanasian Creed. They are of the nature of a *proclamation*. They stand, as our Lord's own words stand, as a warning to the believer of the danger of letting go that which he has received. They speak in close adherence to scriptural phraseology of the doom incurred by those who reject the Saviour of the world. But that is all. To apply them to any given individual is to assume the office of the judge, to whom alone it belongs to administer the law, and to consider how far it applies in the case brought before Him for judgment.

Verse 26: "He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity." Here, again, there is a harshness about the English translation which is absent from the original. If the words ran thus, "Let him, then, who wishes to be safe [or "saved"] thus think of the Trinity," no objection could reasonably be raised to the clause, and such a rendering would far more closely represent the original "Qui vult, ergo, salvus esse: ita de Trinitate sentiat."[1]

[1] Dr. Swainson has pointed out (on the authority of Professor Skeat) that "must" in the sixteenth century often bore a less strong meaning than is now usually attached to it, and was often used in the sense of "would have to," or "should."—*Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 495. The old English version in the Bodleian (Douce, 258), printed by Maskell (*Monumenta Ritualia*, Ed. 2, vol. iii. p. 257) gives the following rendering of the clause, "And who soeuer wele be saafe, yus fele he of ye trinite.'

Verse 27 : " Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that He also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In this sentence the word " rightly " is unfortunate, for to many minds it probably suggests the same idea as " correctly," and seems to imply that strict orthodoxy and correctness of belief is the main thing, making the faith spoken of a matter of the intellect, of the *head* rather than of the *heart*. The Latin, however, is this: "Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi *fideliter* credat " ; and if this word *fideliter* were rendered " faithfully " instead of " rightly," it would be apparent that the belief spoken of is a *moral* quality, and belongs to the *heart* even more than to the *head*.[1] In this case the mistranslation, which is serious, is beyond question due to the fact that the Reformers believed that the creed was the work of Athanasius, and therefore corrected the Latin by reference to a Greek version, which they must have considered the original. The version known to them has been shown by Waterland to be that published by Nicholas Bryling at Basle about 1540, and this, we find, renders *fideliter* in this verse by ὀρθῶς.[2]

Finally, if, in spite of the considerations here urged, it is still maintained that the creed makes everything depend upon a man's belief, it may be well to emphasise the fact that in reality *it is the only one of the three creeds which expressly asserts judgment by works.*

" They that have *done* good [not ' thought correctly ' nor even ' believed rightly '] shall go into life everlasting ; and they that have *done* evil into everlasting fire."

[1] Compare Rom. x. 10, " With the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness."

[2] See Waterland, *Critical History*, ch. v. and x., and cf. *Swainson*, p. 493.

A word may be added with regard to the phrases used to describe the condemnation incurred by those who reject the faith. "Everlastingly" and "everlasting" can scarcely be defended as renderings as *æternus*. It would be better if "eternally" or "eternal" could be substituted, as these are the true equivalents of *in æternum* and *æternum* in clauses 2 and 39. The Latin phrases adequately represent the Greek εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα and αἰώνιος, and, therefore, whatever interpretation we put upon the original sayings of our Lord, the same we are justified in putting upon the quotations of them in the creed. Now, in verse 2, the phrase *in æternum perire* occurs. This is the equivalent used in the Vulgate for ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in S. John xi. 26. Its use in the creed may also be justified by the occurrence of the phrase "eternal destruction" (ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος) which is used of the doom incurred by those who "know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus" in 2 Thess. i. 9.[1] Still more directly are the words of the thirty-ninth verse of the creed founded upon Scripture. They are taken from our Lord's sayings in S. Matthew xxv. 41: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (πῦρ αἰώνιον, Revised Version, "eternal fire"), and in verse 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment (εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, Revised Version, 'eternal punishment'); but the righteous into life eternal."

Whatever, then, our Lord's words mean, *the creed means the same*, for, as the late Dr. Mozley forcibly pointed out, "where the language of a doctrinal formulary and the language of the Bible are the same, whatever explanation we give, in case there is a difficulty, of the language of the Bible is applicable to the language of the formulary as well; and therefore, in such a case,

[1] Compare also the expression "the second death" in Rev. xx. 6.

the statement in the formulary is no fresh difficulty, but only one which we have already surmounted in accepting the same statement in the Bible."[1] Let due weight be given to this consideration, and it is believed that much of the difficulty now felt in some quarters with regard to the acceptance of the creed will be removed.

Appended is the creed itself in the original Latin, as found in the Sarum Breviary.[2]

Symbolum Athanasii.[3]

1. Quicunque vult salvus esse: ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem.

2. Quam nisi quisque integram, inviolatamque servaverit; absque dubio in æternum peribit.

3. Fides autem Catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate: et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur.

4. Neque confundentes personas: neque substantiam separantes.

5. Alia est enim persona Patris: alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti.

6. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est divinitas: æqualis gloria coæterna majestas.

7. Qualis Pater talis Filius; talis Spiritus Sanctus.

8. Increatus Pater increatus Filius: increatus Spiritus Sanctus.

[1] *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 220. In the same volume is contained an important lecture on the Athanasian Creed, to which reference may be made (Lecture xiii.).

[2] Vol. i. col. 46, in the Cambridge edition.

[3] This title is not given to the creed in any ancient MS. Even where it is attributed to Athanasius it is not called *Symbolum*, but *Fides*, as in some of the MSS. referred to above. Various readings in the text of the creed are limited in number. They may be seen in Swainson, p. 532, or Lumby, p. 256.

9. Immensus Pater immensus Filius: immensus Spiritus Sanctus.

10. Æternus Pater æternus Filius: æternus Spiritus Sanctus.

11. Et tamen non tres æterni: sed unus æternus.

12. Sicut non tres increati nec tres immensi: sed unus increatus et unus immensus.

13. Similiter omnipotens Pater omnipotens Filius: omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus.

14. Et tamen non tres Omnipotentes: sed unus Omnipotens.

15. Ita Deus Pater Deus Filius: Deus Spiritus Sanctus.

16. Et tamen non tres Dii: sed unus est Deus.

17. Ita Dominus Pater Dominus Filius: Dominus Spiritus Sanctus.

18. Et tamen non tres Domini: sed unus est Dominus.

19. Quia sicut sigillatim unamquamque personam Deum ac Dominem confiteri, Christiana veritate compellimur:

Ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere, Catholica religione prohibemur.

20. Pater a nullo est factus: nec creatus nec genitus.

21. Filius a Patre solo est: non factus nec creatus sed genitus.

22. Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio: non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.

23. Unus ergo Pater non tres Patres: unus Filius non tres Filii, unus Spiritus Sanctus non tres Spiritus Sancti.

24. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius: nihil majus aut minus.

Sed totæ tres personæ: coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales.

25. Ita ut per omnia sicut jam supradictum est: et Unitas in Trinitate, et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.

26. Qui vult ergo salvus esse: ita de Trinitate sentiat.

27. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem: ut

incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.

28. Est ergo fides recta ut credamus et confiteamur: quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei Filius Deus et homo est.

29. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: et homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus.

30. Perfectus Deus perfectus homo: ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.

31. Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem: minor Patre secundum humanitatem.

32. Qui licet Deus sit et homo: non duo tamen sed unus est Christus.

33. Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carnem: sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum.[1]

34. Unus omnino non confusione substantiæ: sed unitate personæ.

35. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo: ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.

36. Qui passus est pro salute nostra descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

37. Ascendit ad cœlos sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis: inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.

38. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis: et reddituri sunt de factis propiis rationem.

39. Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam æternam: qui vero mala in ignem æternum.

40. Hæc est fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit: salvus esse non poterit.

[1] In this verse the majority of the older MSS. read *in Carne* and *in Deo*.

INDEX

Aachen, Council of, 222.
Abbot, Archbishop, 48.
Abelard, 111.
Admonition to Parliament, 53.
A Lasco, John, 28.
Albertus Magnus, 149.
Alexandria, Council of, 109.
Alley, Bishop, on the descent into hell, 160; on the Old Testament, 281.
Ambrose, 219, 314.
Amphilochius, 249, 265.
Anabaptists, 22, 24, 125, 282.
Andrewes, Bishop, 47.
Anselm, 155.
Apocrypha, 274; Jerome on, 276; Hooker on, 278.
Apollinaris, heresy of, 135.
Apostles' Creed, history of, 305; origin of name, 313; text of, 315.
Aquinas, 171.
Aristides, 140, 299.
Artemon, heresy of, 105.
Ascension of Christ, 189.
Athanasian Creed, not the work of Athanasius, 329; a Latin Creed, 329; origin of name, 330; controversy on date, 331; internal evidence of date, 332; external evidence, 333; MSS. of, 336; contained in early collections of canons, 338; commentaries on, 339; used by early writers, 340; probable date of, 343; use made of by the Church of England, 344; contents of, 345; objections to, 346; mistranslations in, 347; text of, 353.
Athanasius, use of *Hypostasis*, 107; on the *Monarchia*, 116; on *Homoousios*, 126; on Sabellianism, 206; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 256.
Athenagoras, 105, 205.
Atonement, doctrine of, 150; theories of, 154; reveals the Father's love, 154; a mystery, 157.
Augsburg, confession of. See *Confession*.
Augustine on the Trinity, 101, 111, 112; on eternal generation, 123; on the divinity of Christ, 129; on the descent into hell, 167, 171; on the presence of Christ as man, 196; on the Macedonians, 208; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 219; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 250, 256; on the Creed, 300; coincidences with Athanasian Creed, 332, 345.
Autun, Council of, 333.

Barnabas, Epistle of, 270.
Basil, 206.
Baxter, R., 56.
Bede, 171.
Bengel, 115, 147.
Bigg, Rev. C., 108.
Blackburne, Archdeacon, 63.
Browne, Bishop H., on the Articles, 144, 172, 242, 244, 330.
Burke, Edmund, 63.
Burnet, Bishop, 18, 47.
Butler, Bishop, on the Atonement, 157.

Cæsarea, Baptismal Creed of, 316.

Cæsarius of Arles, 309, 342.
Canon of Scripture, meaning of the term, 248; method of determining, 250; difference between England and Rome on, 252; evidence on which the Canon of the New Testament rests, 261.
Cassian, 304.
Carthage, Council of, 257.
Ceremonial Law of Moses not binding on Christians, 294.
Charisius of Philadelphia, 225.
Charlemagne, 221, 313, 337.
Charles the Bald, 337.
Cheke, Sir J., 13, 19.
Chrysostom, 192, 214.
Clarke, Dr. S., 111.
Clement of Alexandria, 171, 248, 275.
Clement of Rome, 104, 205, 248, 270.
Communicatio idiomatum, 138.
Communion of Saints, 311.
Confession of Augsburg, 8, 90, 120, 159, 180.
Confession of Würtemburg, 9, 120, 198, 232.
Confessio Basiliensis, 9.
Confessio Helvetica I. and II., 10.
Confessio Fidei Gallicana, 10.
Confessio Belgica, 10.
Constantinople, Council of, 215; creed of, 324.
Convocation, were the Forty-Two Articles submitted to it? 15.
Cosin, Bishop, 49.
Cranmer, Archbishop, prepares the Forty-Two Articles, 12; his account of the title to them, 17. See also 5, 7, 28, 258.
Creeds, origin of, 297; indications of in New Testament, 297; early forms of, 298; interrogative forms of, 300; introduced into the liturgy, 300; used as tests of orthodoxy, 301; difference between Eastern and Western, 302.
Curteis, Canon, 68.
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 105, 307.
Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon, 309.
Cyril of Alexandria, 216.
Cyril of Jerusalem, catechetical lectures of, 207, 300; on the Canon, 255, 265; on the term Apocryphal, 276; creed of, 321.
Cyril Lucar, confession of, 259.

Dale, R. W., 147, 148.
Deity, properties of, 139.
Denebert, Bishop, profession of, 341.
Descent into hell, change in the Article on, 160. See also *Hell, descent into.*
Diatessaron of Tatian, 269.
Diogenes of Cyzicus, 322.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 107.
Dionysius of Rome, 107.
Divinity of the Son, proved from Scripture, 127; of the Spirit, 199.
Dixon, Canon R. W., 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 17, 29.
Docetism, 145.
Double procession, the doctrine of, 211; objections to, 224.
Driver, Professor, 164, 286, 291, 292.

Enoch, Book of, 164, 287.
Ephesus, seventh canon of the Council of, 225; ratifies the Creed of Nicæa, 324.
Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, on Montanism, 205; creeds given by, 319; cf. 208, 215, 324.
Eternal generation of the Son, 123.
Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Canon of the New Testament, 266; on the creed of Nicæa, 316.
Eutyches, heresy of, 136.

Faustus of Riez, 307.
Filioque, addition of the clause to the creed, 215.
Flesh and blood, meaning of the term, 188.
Flesh and bones, meaning of the term, 188.
Fortunatus, commentary of on the Athanasian Creed, 334.
Forty-Two Articles, history of their preparation, 12; had they the authority of Convocation, 15; their substance and object, 20; not intended to be a permanent test, 25; their sources, 26; how far dependent on the Confession of Augsburg, 26; their text, 70.

Frankfort, Council of, 222.
Freeman, Archdeacon, 203.
Fuller, Church History, 15.
Future life, doctrine of in the Old Testament, 287.

Gallican additions to the creed, 309.
Gardiner, S. R., 48.
Gore, C., 98, 103, 125, 130, 144.
Gregory Nazianzen, 210, 256, 265.
Guest, Bishop, share in the preparation of the Articles, 30; on Article XXIX., 45; suggests further changes, 45.

Hades, 163. See also *Hell*.
Hadrian I., Bishop of Rome, 221, 337.
Hadrian II., 337.
Hamant, Matthew, 120.
Hampton Court Conference, 54.
Hardwick on the Articles, 19, 25, 31, 39, 46, 51, 281.
Hatfield, Council of, 220.
Hefele, Bishop, 256, 258.
Hell, meaning of the word, 163.
Hell, descent into, Scriptural grounds of doctrine, 166; object of, 169; early belief in, 175; history of the article of the creed on, 177; criticism of Pearson on, 179.
Hermas, 205, 270.
Heurtley, Professor, 177, 310, 322.
Heylin, 15.
Hilary of Arles, 332.
Hilary of Poictiers, 110, 218, 256.
Hippolytus, 108.
Holy Ghost, addition of article on, 198; Divinity of, 199; distinct personality of, 201; history of the doctrine of, 204; procession of, 209.
Holy Scripture, changes in the article on, 231; sufficient for salvation, 234; decree of the Council of Trent on, 235; the Fathers on, 242; the Canon of, 248.
Homilies, Book of, on the doctrine of a future life, 293.
Homoousios, meaning of the term, 125; adopted at Nicæa, 125; objections to, 126.
Hooker, R., *Ecclesiastical Polity* of, 47; on the Incarnation, 136, 143; on the *communicatio idiomatum*, 138; on the gift of unction, 142; on the presence of Christ as man, 194; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 251; on the Apocrypha, 278.
Hooper, Bishop, on the Articles, 13; on the Anabaptists, 22, 145; on the descent into hell, 169.
Horsley, Bishop, 165, 173.
Humanity of Christ perfect, 141.
Humphreys, 41.
Hypostatic union, the, 137.
Hypostasis, history of the word, 107.

Ignatius, 104, 140, 175, 205, 210, 270.
Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, 103.
Incarnation, Doctrine of, 137 *seq.*
Inferi and *Inferna*, 163.
Institution of a Christian man, 5.
Irenæus, 140, 153, 175, 241, 269, 275, 298, 303.

Jerome on the word *hypostasis*, 111; on the Apocrypha, 232, 256; on the term *Canonical*, 250, 275; on the Creed, 307, 314.
Jesus Christ. See *Son of God*.
Jewel, Bishop, 44, 195.
Josephus, 253.
Judgment, the last, 196.
Justin Martyr, 104, 140, 175, 204, 269, 271, 299.

Kaye, Bishop, 246.
Kirkpatrick, Professor, 289.
Knox, John, 14.

Lambeth Articles, 53.
Laodicæa, Council of, 256.
Laud, Archbishop, advises charter to prefix declaration to the Articles, 49; on Canon V., 67.
Leicester, Earl of, 64.
Leo III. on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 223.
Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, 113, 117, 123, 125, 130, 144.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 270, 327.
Logos, doctrine of the, 122.

Lumby, Professor, on the Athanasian Creed, 335 *seq.*
Luther on the Canon of the New Testament, 272.

Macedonius, heresy of, 207.
Marcellus of Ancyra, heresy of, 321; creed of, 306.
Martensen, Bishop, 191.
Maurice, Rev. F. D., 292.
Medd, Rev. P. G., 96.
Mediation of Christ, 152.
Medieval errors condemned in the Forty-Two Articles, 21.
Melito of Sardis, 255.
Messianic hope in the Old Testament, 285.
Micronius, Martin, 23, 161.
Mill, Rev. W. H., 246.
Milligan, Professor, 189.
Moehler, 237.
Monarchia, doctrine of the, 115.
Montague, Bishop, 48, 49.
Montanism, 205.
Moral law binding on Christians, 294.
Muratori, 333.
Muratorian fragment on the Canon, 267.

Neal, D., 55.
Necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man, 5.
Nestorius, heresy of, 136.
Newdigate, Sir R., 63.
New Testament, Canon of, 261; MSS. of, 261; versions of, 263; catalogues of, 265; citations of, 268; language of Article VI. on, 271.
Newman, J. H., 114, 237, 274.
Nicæa, Council of, 124.
Nicene Creed, original form of, 316; enlarged form of, 318; date and object of the enlargement, 321; possibly sanctioned at Constantinople, 324; not noticed at Ephesus, 324; sanctioned at Chalcedon, 324; additions at Toledo, 215; Latin version of, 327; English translation of, 327.
Nicholas I., Pope, 224.
Nicholas III., Pope, 228.
Norris, Archdeacon, 153, 155, 348.

Old Testament, Canon of the, 252; changes in the Article on, 280; not contrary to the New, 283.
Ommanney, Rev. Prebendary, 339.
Origen, his use of *Ousia* and *Hypostasis*, 107, 108; on eternal generation, 123; uses the term *Homoousios*, 126; on 1 Pet. iii. 18, 171; on the term Canonical, 249; on the Canon of Scripture, 255.

Ousia, history of the term, 107.
Oxenham, H. N., 155.

Palmer, Sir W., 241, 242, 244.
Papias, 269.
Paradise, 166.
Parker, Archbishop, prepares the Thirty-Eight Articles, 30, 32; suggests clause in Article XXVIII., 36; changes made by him, 120, 160, 198, 259; on the descent into hell, 161.
Paul of Samosata, 127.
Pearson, Bishop, on the position of the Articles, 39; on the unity of God, 91; on the Trinity, 116; on the Son of God, 121; on the descent into hell, 169, 171, 189; on the Macedonian heresy, 199; on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, 201; on the procession of the Holy Ghost, 211.
Perichoresis, doctrine of the, 117.
Perrone, 237.
Person, history of the term, 105; explanation of, 112.
Peter, Gospel of, 176.
Philpot, Archdeacon, his explanation of the title of the Articles, 17.
Philo, 254.
Photius, 224.
Pirminius on the Creed, 310.
Pius IV., Pope, 11, 12.
Plumptre, Dean, 171, 180.
Pneumatomachi, the, 208.
Polycarp, 270.
Praxeas, 106.
Presence of Christ as man, nature of the, 193.
Procession of the Holy Ghost, doctrine of the, 209.
Prynne, W., 49.
Pusey, E. B., 218, 219, 234.

Ransom, Christ's death a, 155.

Reccared, 215.
Reconciliation of God to man, 146.
Redditio Symboli, 300.
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, 28, 90, 120, 182, 198, 232, 259.
Regula fidei, 305.
Resurrection of Christ, evidence for the, 183.
Resurrection body, nature of the, 186.
Resurrection of the flesh, 311.
Reynolds, Dr., 54.
Roman Creed, early, 306.
Roscellinus, 111.
Row, Prebendary, 186.
Royal declaration prefixed to the Articles, 47.
Rufinus, on the Creed, 178, 304 *seq.*, 314; on the Canon of Scripture, 249, 256, 265, 275.

Sabellianism, 106, 206.
Sacrifice, Christ's death a, 148.
Salvus, meaning of the word, 347.
Sampson, 41.
Sanday, Professor, 148, 269, 271.
Scarapsus, 310.
Session at the right-hand of God, meaning of the expression, 192; evidence for, 192.
Sheol, Hebrew conception of, 163.
Sherlock, Dean, 111.
Socrates, 177, 324.
Son, meaning of the term, 122.
Son of God, eternal generation of, 122 *seq.*; incarnation of, 135 *seq.*; union of two natures in one person, 137; atonement of, 145 *seq.*
South, Dr., 111.
Subscription to the Articles, required by Parliament, 43; required by Convocation, 57; form of, modified, 63; not required from the laity, 64; history of, at the universities, 64.
Substance, history of the term, 107.
Swainson, Professor, 335.
Swete, Professor, 104, 177, 205, 208, 213, 310 *seq.*
Symbolum, meaning of the term, 304.

Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 221.
Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 242.
Ten Articles of 1536, the, 3.
Tertullian, 105, 107, 108, 140, 166, 176, 213, 241, 248, 269, 275, 298, 303, 311.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 216, 225.
Theodore of Tarsus, 220.
Theodoret, 216, 324.
Theodotus, 105.
Theophilus of Antioch, 105, 204.
Theotocos, title of, 136.
Thirteen Articles of 1538, 7.
Thirty-Eight Articles of 1563, history of the, 30; compared with the Forty-Two Articles, 38; indebted to the Confession of Würtemburg, 38; submitted to Convocation, 30; changes introduced by the Queen, 31.
Thirty-Nine Articles, revision of 1571, 42; their true character, 38, 52; Latin and English both authoritative, 46; royal declaration prefixed to, 50; Puritan objections to, 51 *seq.*; subscription to, see *Subscription*.
Toledo, third council of, 215.
Traditio Symboli, 300.
Tradition and Scripture, 236 *seq.*
Trent, Council of, 10, 235, 252.
Trinity, the Holy, preparation for the doctrine in the Old Testament, 93; revelation of in the New Testament, 98; the doctrine agreeable to reason, 101; first occurrence of the word, 104; meaning of the doctrine, 114; priority of order in the, 116.

Unction, gift of, 142.
Usher, Archbishop, 333.
Utrecht Psalter, the, 334.

Vaughan, Dean, 134, 204.
Venantius Fortunatus, 178, 334.
Vincent of Lerins, 243, 343.
Virgin, Christ born of a, 140.

Waterland, D., on the Articles, 46; on subscription, 62; vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity, 111; on the Athanasian Creed, 331 *seq.*

Westcott, Bishop, 97, 117, 122, 130, 134, 156, 169, 184, 185, 186, 188, 191, 211, 250, 256, 258, 302.
Westminster assembly of divines. 55.
Whitaker, Professor, 54.
Whitgift, Archbishop, Three Articles of, 58; subscription to them required by the Canons of 1604, 59.
Wiseman, Cardinal, 237.
Würtemburg, Confession of, see *Confession*.

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

DATE DUE

JUL 31 1996

AUG 2[illegible] 1996

6

DEMCO 38-297

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01016 5324